

179674st

THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 3 VOL. III, NO. 7.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

PERSONAL & POLITICAL.

The discussion at the meeting of the Brooklyn county committee of the united labor party on Tuesday evening of last week, Dr. McGlynn's speech at the meeting of the down-town branch of the Anti-poverty society on the following Thursday evening, and various utterances and expressions which have since been made through the press, make it necessary, in justice to myself and to my friends, that I should speak of matters thus brought up with greater frankness than I have hitherto cared to use, either in talking through these columns with the readers of THE STANDARD, or in replying by letter to those who have written me on the subject of the coming presidential campaign.

For some little time past an effort has been made, rather by insinuation and innuendo than by direct statement, to put me in the position of abandoning principle, for the purpose of helping the democratic party. In THE STANDARD of the last issue but one I printed two letters from the west in which I was remonstrated with for turning away from principle, and it was intimated in the "they are saying" style that I was engaged in "making a deal" with the democratic party. I did not feel it necessary in commenting upon these intimations to go further than the obvious considerations which were suggested by their face. In the general review of the political situation from our standpoint, of which I made these letters the text, I merely pointed out that—

If it be assumed that our not running a ticket will be to the advantage of the democrats, it must also be assumed that our running a ticket will be to the advantage of the republicans. If, then, our refusal to run a ticket is to give rise to charges that we have sold out to the democrats, how much more certain is it that, if we do run a ticket, we will be charged with having been paid by the republicans to do so, and thus in the eyes of those who at other times might be disposed to be with us, be placed in the same contemptible position in which the Butler campaign lauded the greenback labor party, that of being a mere jackal and cat-saw for the republicans?

This was as far as I cared to go, even under considerable provocation, in alluding to a matter that has been an important consideration in my thought and in the thought of some of us here in New York who have been in a position to really understand what lay beneath the proposition to run a candidate on a don't-touch-the-tariff-question platform. This was as far as I had expected in any event to go, or to be compelled to go, for I felt, not merely an indisposition to anything like the public "washing of dirty linen," but a very strong reluctance to assume an attitude that should savor of unfriendly opposition to Dr. McGlynn.

That same reluctance I feel now. But since the charges to which the letters of Mr. Williams and Mr. Bailey gave me opportunity in some sort to reply have not only been put in more direct and more tangible form by the gentleman who is managing secretary of the committee that constitute all the state and general organization which the united labor party has, but have been vehemently re-echoed in the Anti-poverty society and through the press by Dr. McGlynn himself, I should do injustice not only to myself but to others if I did not speak more freely and frankly.

Of Mr. Barnes's asseverations of a friendship and intimacy, which, however much they may have existed for a while, have for some time ceased to exist, and of the fly-on-the-chariot-wheel egotism which leads him to claim credit for my nomination for mayor or for my refusal of the offer of a seat in congress, it is not worth while to speak. The statement to which all this was intended to give weight and point, was that in response to a question from him, I had declared that if a united labor party candidate were nominated this year on the Syracuse platform I would not support him. In form this is not true. In spirit it is untrue. For what Mr. Barnes sought to convey, and did convey, to the Brooklyn committee was the same idea which has since been substantially repeated by Dr. McGlynn—that I was primarily bent on the support of Mr. Cleveland, and for this reason had deliberately turned away from the principles of the Syracuse platform.

With the exception of a few casual words on one of the days immediately succeeding the election, in which I understood Mr. Barnes to express the belief that the result of that election had made hopeless any idea of our entering the presidential campaign, the only conversation in which he could have heard anything like this from me was a conversation in which a number of gentlemen took part. In a communication published in the *Herald*, Mr. Barnes, reiterating the statement, says I made the declaration to him in the presence of Mr. John McMackin and others. Thus there can be no doubt that it was this conversation he had in mind. And since Mr. Barnes in his course in this matter has the support of Dr. McGlynn and Mr. McMackin, whatever tacit obligation I might otherwise have been under as to speaking of such a conversation is now removed.

There were present at this conversation,

which took place at 28 Cooper Union, about five or six weeks after the election, Dr. McGlynn, Mr. Barnes and Mr. McMackin, who constitute the land and labor committee, and (as the majority of the five) virtually the executive committee of the state committee; and Mr. Louis F. Post, Mr. W. T. Croasdale, Mr. J. W. Sullivan and myself. It was a little informal conference or "talk over," called by Dr. McGlynn, at my request, made as soon as I found the serious divergence as to policy that existed between us. If any of us last named have any claim to be considered "leaders" of the united labor party or anti-poverty movement, this is the only conference or consultation that has yet taken place between these "leaders" on this most important matter. If any other consultations have been held, they have not included any of us.

At this informal conference, the talk ran not so much on nominating a presidential candidate, as on what was really the more fundamental and primary question of platform, and on the manner and terms of the call for the nominating assemblage. The plan of the members of the committee as then developed to us was to ignore the tariff question—to declare in the platform and assume on the stump that the masses of the people had no concern either with protection or free trade. It was after my protest against this that I was asked—not by Mr. Barnes, but by Dr. McGlynn—not whether I would support a presidential candidate of the united labor party if he were nominated on the Syracuse platform, but, whether I would be satisfied to go into the national campaign on the Syracuse platform. To this I responded that I would not. I am not in the habit of sailing under false colors, or of hiding from friend or foe my real sentiments on important public questions; and even if I had deemed the Syracuse platform sufficiently explicit on all points for a national campaign, it would have become unsatisfactory the moment it was proposed to use it to straddle a vital issue.

The plan of the committee as developed to us was, further, to call, not a conference, but a convention, and to make the terms of the call such as would exclude any but those prepared to go into the presidential contest. There was no objection on our part to the calling of a national conference, but there was strong objection to forestalling the proper function of that conference by calling at once a convention, and especially to the proposed exclusion in the terms of the "etc." It was further intimated that the states in which it was proposed to make a vigorous campaign were New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Indiana—the four states namely in which we might help to give electoral votes to the republicans. The object of this was not denied. It was asserted that the democratic party was our bitter enemy, and that what we ought to try to do in practical politics was to aid the republicans to beat it. And, lastly, it was suggested that the word labor ought to be retained in the name of the party—the significance of which, while we had some inkling of it at the time, has more fully appeared since.

Instead of reconciling differences, this conversation merely showed the irreconcilable nature of the difference that existed. Messrs. Post, Croasdale, Sullivan and myself left with the clear conviction that what the central committee of the land and labor party were thinking of really amounted to nothing no less than the Butlerizing of the united labor party and the turning of the political side of the anti-poverty movement into a republican annex, which might in the coming campaign help to assure protectionism a new lease of plunder and a new opportunity to rivet its bonds on the people of the United States.

I am not to be understood as questioning motives, and especially the motives of a man for whom I have so sincere a respect as I have for Dr. McGlynn. He has no bias toward protectionism and no special love either for Mr. Blaine or for the republican party. He is a free trader, with clear convictions of the absurdity and impolicy of protection, and was a political friend and efficient supporter of Mr. Cleveland in his first election. What is mainly influencing him, as was obvious from his remarks in this conversation, is his not unnatural hostility toward the "ecclesiastical machine," which he seems to think is identified, in our cities at least, with the democratic party, and his belief that a presidential campaign during which, at least the four states named, might be found to hold meetings and keep speakers traveling, would afford a good opportunity to preach the doctrine of "land for the people."

I do not question Dr. McGlynn's motives, but for my part I claim the right to take a different view. There are, to my mind, things of much more importance than the "ecclesiastical machine," and I am not ready to sacrifice principle for the opportunity to preach principle. I am not ready to do what I clearly feel to be evil in the hope that good may come. I am not ready to eat my words and to stultify my record. I am not ready to become the stalking horse and decoy duck of any political combination. I have never quarreled with nor denounced Dr. McGlynn because of his opinions. Yet it is because I have refused to surrender not merely my opinions but my firm

convictions that he has assumed to excommunicate me from the united labor party and to declare that, if ever permitted to come back, it must be to take a much humbler position. If the doctor will think he will find it difficult to imagine a much humbler position than that which, out of deference to him and an indisposition to have any difference with him, I have for some time occupied—that of an ostensible leader in a party in whose managing counsels I have been utterly ignored.

The protest of Messrs. Post, Croasdale, Sullivan and myself, made at the conversation of which I have spoken, against the programme of the committee—and especially the emphatic denials on the part of Messrs. Post and Croasdale of any authority on the part of the committee to issue a call for a nominating convention instead of a conference or to prescribe a test that would exclude those not in favor of nominating—seemed to give the committee pause; and the call, which we were informed was to have been issued in a few days, has not yet to my knowledge appeared. I have had no further information of the plans of the committee or of what they have been doing, but it has been plain from what has since occurred that the disposition to thus turn the united labor party into a republican side show has strengthened, not weakened, though our refusal to lend ourselves has made it much more difficult, and opinions adverse to any attempt to enter national politics this year have been gaining ground. It has been evident from the columns of THE STANDARD that the more thoughtful and influential men of the party all over the country have, even without any knowledge of the inside purpose of the committee, been coming to the conclusion that it would be impolitic for the united labor party to run a presidential campaign this year, and that a very great number even of those who are disposed to stand up and be counted are not prepared to ignore the tariff question. The recent letter of Judge McGuire, who has been much talked of as an available presidential candidate, in which he declared against going into the presidential campaign, must have been to the committee especially indicative of the drift of opinion. It is this consciousness of losing ground which I think led to the open and deliberate attack which was begun in the Brooklyn county committee last Tuesday night. At a previous meeting of the New York county committee a resolution drawn by Mr. Barnes *declaring the determination of the party "not to be diverted by any issue of tariff tinkering from exclusive and unswerving support of the fundamental reforms set forth in the Syracuse platform,"* was railroaded through without the members seeing its real import, and before the committee had, in fact, organized. In the Brooklyn committee, where Mr. Barnes has a seat and Mr. Wilder, a staunch Blaine protectionist, is chairman, it was evidently determined to put forth this policy in stronger form, and to back it up by a formal reading of me out of the party. Mr. Barnes having begun, Dr. McGlynn followed at the branch anti-poverty meeting on Thursday night.

Mr. Barnes and Dr. McGlynn have assumed to put me in the position of one who has turned aside. But is it not really they who have changed? Up to the time when the election returns showed that we had but 70,000 votes when we had expected 150,000, it was assumed almost as a matter of course that we would enter the national field in the presidential campaign; but whatever might have been thought by such half converts as Mr. Wilder, no one intelligently acquainted with the principles we had asserted ever dreamed of ignoring the tariff question in a national campaign. I, certainly, never heard such an idea breathed. On the contrary it was expected that we would be THE free trade party, and as it was assumed that the democratic party would still try to slirk the tariff issue, we believed that by raising the standard of unqualified free trade in the national campaign we would call to its support many from both old parties that we could not at first attract in any other way.

As for the Syracuse platform, I was the chairman of the committee that drafted it and reported it, and no one who knows me will dream that I would have been a party to anything which was in the nature of a compromise between protectionism and free trade in a national campaign. The principle of free trade is stated in abstract in the Syracuse platform, but the campaign for which it was made being purely a state campaign, no one thought it necessary when no question of principle was involved to run any risk of offending any protectionist who might be disposed to act with us by using the terms "protection" or "free trade." It was not supposed at Syracuse that the platform itself was to be made the platform of a national party, but merely that the great principles therein laid down were to be made the framework of a national platform. The notion of ignoring the tariff question in a national campaign was never thought of, even at 28 Cooper Union until some time after the election, since one of the first suggestions talked of (and for a time at least, as I am informed by Mr. Croasdale, received favorably by Mr. Barnes

himself) was that of joining forces with the free traders in running presidential candidates, and I was invited to make an address before the Anti-poverty society on the tariff question—something which could hardly have occurred if Mr. Barnes and Dr. McGlynn had at that time taken their present view of the tariff question.

The proposition to ignore the tariff question arises from the desire to have a party, not from the desire to advance a principle. And to this desire to have and to run a party all things, it is evident, are to be made to bend. Just after the last election Dr. McClynn made a very strong speech at an anti-poverty meeting at the Academy of Music, in which, with great emphasis, he declared that we must get rid of the word "labor" in our political designation, and declared his preference for the "commonwealth party." Now, what his committee are waiting for and hoping for is the formation of one of these "labor parties," composed of politically incongruous elements which have time and again proved utter failures.

Last spring we of the united labor party of New York steadily refused to have anything to do with the attempt to form another "union of all the labor elements," which at a conference of all sorts of "reformers" held in Cincinnati, resulted in the formation of what is called the "union labor party." We (the committee included) not only refused to have anything to do with this attempt to manufacture a party, but we derided its method and the inconsequential platform which was the result of the compromises of such a mixture of heterogeneous "ists" and "ismus."

Now, in their desire to get up a party of some kind, there are various significant indications that the committee of which Dr. McGlynn is head are planning to make a mergerment of what they would call the united labor party with the union labor party, the socialists and all the other so-called "labor elements," upon some sort of a hodge-podge platform, giving if necessary the presidential candidate to the union labor party, but of course retaining the position of secretary—one of much greater practical importance in a party when anything might befall the presidential candidate except that he should get an electoral vote.

I have never said that I would support Mr. Cleveland, and whatever report may have been made to this effect is false. What I have said is that IF Mr. Cleveland in the next campaign stands for the free trade side of the tariff issue I will support him. And I say so in advance, as I think every man who so feels ought to say, because the protectionists within the democratic party are striving to defeat Mr. Cleveland's renomination, on the ground that he cannot be elected because of the free trade of his message.

I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Cleveland; I never even set eyes on him. I have had no communication with him or any of his friends directly or indirectly. In the last presidential campaign I refused to make speeches for him when asked to. I would have worked and voted for Butler had it not been evident that he was in the field only to help the republican ticket. As it was, I did not stay at home to vote for anybody, but a few days before the election went off to Scotland, where our friends wanted me. But I first got a Blaine man to agree that if I went he would not vote—because I believed that the quicker the party that had been so long in power was ousted the quicker would the economic question come up and party lines be drawn on new issues. This choice between the parties—that one was in and the other was out—was all I could see in that election.

This year the hope I see of bringing on a general discussion of economic or social questions (for the social questions are at bottom economic) is far clearer and nearer. It lies in doing the utmost that can be done to widen the breach that the tariff question is beginning to make in the lines of both the old parties, and in pushing on the free trade fight even though at first it takes the shape of mere half-hearted tariff reform. That is the reason I shall, under the conditions mentioned, support Mr. Cleveland. I shall support any other man in his stead who shall fulfill this condition, for my support will have in it no personal element. I shall support Mr. Cleveland from the same motives that induced me to run for mayor and for secretary of state—because I see in the pushing forward of the tariff question the best way at present of using national politics, of clearing the way for the great principle which I regard as of most importance, and of moving toward a recognition of the equal rights of American citizens in their native land.

I would, of course, very much rather support a presidential candidate who should stand on the principles of the united labor party as I understand them. But to go no further, it now seems to me idle to hope that if we were to put up such a candidate we could poll our real strength for him; and the very attempt on the part of so many to enter the national field on the basis of ignoring the most important national issues, is, to my mind, evidence that the process of education has not yet gone far enough to enable us to act together in national politics.

Under these circumstances I will support Mr. Cleveland, not as the thing I would best like to do, but as the best thing I can

do. When the wind is ahead the sailor does not insist on keeping his ship to the course he would like to go. That would be to drift astern. Nor yet for the sake of having a fair wind does he keep his yards square and sail anywhere else than the wind may carry him. He says "full and by," lying as near the course he would like to go as with the existing wind he can. He cannot make the wind, but he can use it.

In supporting Mr. Cleveland, if he shall stand against protection, and the struggle between him and the republican nominee shall be made on the tariff issue, I shall not be joining the democratic party nor in any way interfering with my liberty to oppose that party anywhere else or in any other thing. Nor for my support of Mr. Cleveland as the representative of the free trade side of the tariff fight will I expect any thanks. The spoils hunting democratic politicians who will have to be kicked into that fight, and who will try to protest that no real harm is meant to the sacred white elephant of protection, will have no thanks for the support of those whose declared object it is to abolish protection entirely, and not merely to abolish protection entirely but to abolish the tariff entirely, and to bring about with the whole world as perfect freedom of trade as now exists between the states of the American Union. It may perhaps even be that the support of radical free traders like myself will not help Mr. Cleveland's election. But I shall care very little for Mr. Cleveland's election. What I care for is to bring on the tariff discussion. For I regard the general discussion of the tariff question as involving greater possibilities of popular economic education than anything else. And as I have often said when myself standing as a candidate, what I care for is not how men vote, but how they think.

In all this I speak only for myself. I never proposed that the united labor party should indorse Mr. Cleveland or any other candidate of any other party. I have never presumed to control any vote but my own or to lead any one, who stands with me on state issues, in any direction on national issues in which he is not inclined of himself to go. My position is and has been this: When we are agreed let us act together. When we disagree let us agree to disagree without prejudice to our acting together at such times and in such fields as we can act together. I shall not accuse Mr. Wilder of going back on the position he took last fall if on the tariff question he supports what I oppose, nor will any opposition in which we may thus be placed on this question of national taxation prevent me from striking hands with him when he comes again into the field where the issue is of state taxation.

I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Cleveland; I never even set eyes on him. I have had no communication with him or any of his friends directly or indirectly. In the last presidential campaign I refused to make speeches for him when asked to. I would have worked and voted for Butler had it not been evident that he was in the field only to help the republican ticket. As it was, I did not stay at home to vote for anybody, but a few days before the election went off to Scotland, where our friends wanted me. But I first got a Blaine man to agree that if I went he would not vote—because I believed that the quicker the party that had been so long in power was ousted the quicker would the economic question come up and party lines be drawn on new issues. This choice between the parties—that one was in and the other was out—was all I could see in that election.

I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Cleveland; I never even set eyes on him. I have had no communication with him or any of his friends directly or indirectly. In the last presidential campaign I refused to make speeches for him when asked to. I would have worked and voted for Butler had it not been evident that he was in the field only to help the republican ticket. As it was, I did not stay at home to vote for anybody, but a few days before the election went off to Scotland, where our friends wanted me. But I first got a Blaine man to agree that if I went he would not vote—because I believed that the quicker the party that had been so long in power was ousted the quicker would the economic question come up and party lines be drawn on new issues. This choice between the parties—that one was in and the other was out—was all I could see in that election.

There is a superficial plausibility in the motive of "going straight on" that at first captivates the impulsive. But when it is seen that what is meant by going straight on is to make a national campaign on what are really state issues, to ignore the issue that is likely to divide the people, and to run off to the territories for some excuse for appearing in a national campaign; and when it is seen that what is to be achieved practically by this is to be one of the two great parties in doubtful states, and to land the united labor party in the same ignominious death trap into which Butler led the greenback labor party, I have no question of what will be the verdict of the majority of our friends.

We have with us those to whom party is everything—those who wish a party on any terms and at any cost, because their connection with it, even if it be a little, bit of a party, may give them position and influence that they would not have without it. But to the great body of our friends party is not an end but a means. They are not to be led to sacrifice principle by any pretended necessity of keeping up a party. Nor are they to be used as tools. When they want to help a republican

president they will vote the republican ticket.

The tendency of those who find power and profit in organization to exalt the means above the end and to regard the maintenance of the organization itself as more important than the securing of what the organization was formed to promote—a tendency to which is mainly due the corruptions of churches and parties—receives a curious illustration in the attitude of the cigarmakers' unions toward the internal revenue tax on tobacco and cigars. Cigar making has been so little affected by machinery that it is in itself one of the few remaining trades in which the workman can easily become his own employer and the concentration of capital gives little advantage. With a board, a knife, a little paste and a few pounds of tobacco a competent cigarmaker has all that is necessary to enable him to go to work, while nothing would be easier, did the law permit him, than for him to find a direct market in the consumer for his product. But the operation of our tax laws is to make it practically impossible for the cigarmaker to avail himself of his own skill and to concentrate the business in the hands of large employers. First comes the tariff tax on imported tobacco and the internal revenue tax on domestic tobacco. The effect of these is to raise the price of tobacco, not only by the tax but also to increase the amount of capital required for providing stock. Then come the internal revenue restrictions on the making of cigars, which not only require the payment of a license fee, but the giving of bonds based on real estate to the amount of \$500 apiece for the first two men engaged, and \$100 apiece for each additional man, the keeping of an elaborate set of books and the purchase of revenue stamps. In addition, a man cannot sell cigars in quantities less than a box, even though he has made them and has paid a tax for the privilege of making them without first taking out a United States dealers' license and generally a local license as well.

It is very natural that the large cigar manufacturers should be in favor of the retention of this system of taxation, which practically forbids the workman to go into business for himself, and compels him to sell his labor to an employer. Yet all the officials of the cigarmakers' unions seem to be as warmly in favor of the tax as are the manufacturers, and at the national convention of the union, held at Binghamton last October, resolutions opposing the repeal of the internal revenue taxes on cigar making were passed. The explanation is that the laws which forbid cigarmakers to go to work for themselves and mass them in factories or tenement shops in the employ of large manufacturers, compel them as the only way of preventing themselves from being entirely at the mercy of employers to organize unions and occasionally to go on strikes. The officials of the unions favor the laws which prevent workmen from employing themselves, because in forcing them into the factories or tenement shops of large employers, they make more necessary the unions.

Saturday, Feb. 11. HENRY GEORGE.

A Missionary's Report.

OWENSBORO, KY.—The 53 tracts you sent me while I was in Henderson I have carefully distributed with good effect. This is a

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Effect of the Single Tax in England.

DUNTRAIL, Canada.—In an issue of THE STANDARD answering your Danbury correspondent regarding the land tax, you say you would allow the present owners to retain the fee of the land so long as they paid the taxes on it. Would you kindly let me know how that would affect land monopolists in Britain? If tenant farmers are still to pay their rents to the land owners as before, where are they to derive their benefit so long as there is competition for land? J. G.

The tenants would have no taxes to pay; the landlords, deprived of their unearned incomes, would soon be obliged to go to work; production would be greater, business would be brisker and wages would be higher. But this improvement, great as it would be, would not be all. While the land of England is more truly all in use than that of America, there is a great deal of land there which is practically out of use. Land which rich landlords have devoted to selfish pleasure, if taxed to its full value, would be too expensive a luxury for lords without other incomes than such as they earned, and it would come upon the market. Then there is a great deal of land in England which is but poorly improved, but under the single tax it would pay better to improve it to its highest point, and that would have the effect of an augmentation of the land of the country. So you may see that, even though the single tax were confined to England, competition for land would be less intense; but if the tax were in force in other countries also, the economic boundaries of England would extend to all those countries. Wherever the single tax is in full force no land can long be much dearer than similar land elsewhere; in fact, if the single tax were in full force in any country of large territory relative to population, it would diminish land values everywhere.

Characteristic of Wealth.

NEW YORK.—(1) Are there, according to Mr. George, any other characteristics of economic wealth than the following:

- a. It must have exchange value.
- b. It must be tangible.
- c. It must have and retain the power of ministering to human desires.
- d. It must be the result of human labor on material things.
- e. It must be an object or substance as modified by human labor.

(2) Knowledge is not wealth because it is not tangible. And it is not an object or substance modified by human labor. But written words have an exchange value and have all the other above characteristics of wealth. Even spoken words have exchange value (although sometimes consumed immediately upon exchange), are tangible because they can be heard, have the power of ministering to human desires, are the result of labor on air and land, and are the very substance (air) as modified by human labor. Spoken words even retain the power of ministering to human desires so long as they can be heard—by echo for a few seconds and for years by the phonograph. A bushel of wheat can do no more. Which is the right way to regard the musician as a producer? Does he produce music which has exchange value, etc.? Or does he indirectly produce tools, shoes, clothes, houses, machinery, etc., because music is a civilized commodity? Is necessary to the production of tools, houses, etc.?

(3) Has actual goodness of the product anything to do with economic wealth? I think now that it has not. The question is, in what estimate is the product held? Is there any body to offer something in exchange? Whisky would cease to be wealth if people ceased to drink it for use.

(4) What answers shall we give to those people who say that withholding valuable land from use can be no worse than compelling a nation to live on smaller territory, and therefore cannot be very bad as the whole world could subsist on the territory of Texas?

E. D. BURKHROFF.

(1) I should say not.

(2) Words are not wealth, whether written or spoken. A book is wealth; but an orator, like a musician, merely performs a service in exchange for which other people produce the wealth that he requires, and which he would otherwise have to produce himself. When, in return for the service he performs he collects clothing and food from the circle of exchanges, he directs labor to the production of more clothing and food; therefore it is virtually clothing and food that he produces.

(3) Economically the actual goodness of an article does not determine whether or not it is wealth. In this connection the determining fact is whether the product may enter into the circle of exchanges.

(4) If the whole world could subsist in Texas, no man would be in danger of starvation or be dependent for a living on any other man if equal natural rights were preserved among the inhabitants; but if there were only one man in Texas he would soon be a corpse or a slave if deprived of his natural right to land.

Profits of Land Speculation.

BROOKLYN.—In argument on the tariff, monopoly, the single tax, etc., with a respected friend, a thirty years' resident and tradesman of Brooklyn, I was astonished, nonplussed, "knocked out" by the following assertions he made:

(1) That all vacant lots are taxed just the same as improved lots, in Brooklyn, New York and all principal cities.

(2) That vacant lots, even in the heart of the city and growing in value in the ordinary way, are the most unprofitable thing for any man to invest in, as in ten years the value of any vacant lot will be eaten up by the taxes; that the taxes upon them do not compel him to improve them or sell them.

(3) That no owner of vacant lots can clear anything on them unless by a very rapid rise in value, say, in two or three years, because of the taxes.

(4) That you could find hardly half a dozen people in Brooklyn who have grown rich by merely buying and selling vacant lots, the taxes are so heavy.

(5) That the Astors have not, and do not, make their money by holding for a rise merely vacant land; that their wealth has been made by improving lots.

(6) That a man may make a fortune by buying and selling lots in far away towns, but that these cases are isolated ones, and do not occur in cities like New York or Brooklyn.

(7) Please explain why so many thousands of empty acres are being held if their value is thus eaten up by taxes; and why nobody has thought of bursting up Henry George's false statements before now? F. SCRIMSHAW.

(1) As to New York this is not true. Improved land here is assessed at from 50 to 60 per cent of its true value, while un-

improved land is assessed all the way down to 18 per cent and less. I cannot speak definitely of Brooklyn, but if you write to the Brooklyn *Real Estate Review* I think you will find that, as in New York so in Brooklyn, unimproved land generally pays a lower tax relatively to its true value than improved land. I am quite sure also that the same fact holds in all the principle cities. It is done on the theory that a man who is getting no income from his land ought not to pay so high a tax as a man who is getting an income from his.

(2) That it pays, on the average, to buy vacant land for a rise is evident from the fact that so much vacant land is bought for just that purpose. Men do not invest their money in a direction that involves certain loss. It may be that a vacant lot in the heart of the city if kept vacant for ten years will yield no profit. That is more apt to happen with a vacant lot in the suburbs, for the proportion of increase is certain to be less and the rate of tax is likely to be higher. But the value of the lot would not be eaten up unless it was in a retrograding locality. If present taxes do not now compel such owners to sell or improve it is because these taxes are low enough to allow a reasonable expectation of future profit. If the taxes were high enough to remove that possibility a different result would follow.

But the nub of the question is not whether this man or that does or may make a profit from vacant land; it is whether he stands in the way of improvement, for it is improvement that makes business and business that makes prosperity.

(3) That may or may not be. It is immaterial, since the real injury is the keeping of useful land out of use.

(4) I doubt the statement; but it is immaterial. There are more than half a dozen people who have interfered with the prosperity of Brooklyn by holding vacant lots and putting prices on them that prevented improvement, and there are more than half a dozen people in Brooklyn who owe their wealth to land values.

(5) The Astors are not land speculators in the ordinary sense. They do not buy and sell. Their policy is to buy along the backbone of the city, somewhat in advance of the movement of population, to hold or lease until population reaches them, and then to build. Their profits come from the high ground rents which they get in consequence of greater demand for their land. It may be said that their wealth has been made by improving, but the bulk of it has been made out of the rise in their land values, not out of their improvements. If land were taxed to its full value the Astors would not take up in advance of population and hold it; they would take it up only as they wanted to build. Nor would they accumulate wealth from mere ground rents; their wealth would consist of returns for capital which they kept active, and of nothing else.

(6) Quite so; but as I have already said, it is not so much a question of whether some men make fortunes by speculations in land as whether many men are kept in a state of dependence in consequence of such speculation. If a dozen men robbed a hundred in some vulgar way, the net proceeds of the robbery might not be enough when divided by their conduct endangered the freedom of the institutions of the United States;

(7) Considering that the freedom of each individual citizen can only be guaranteed by the perpetuation of the freedom of the institutions of our country; If that is the case, then the freedom of each individual citizen can only be guaranteed by the perpetuation of the freedom of the institutions of our country;

(8) Considering that monopolistic companies obtain their existence and power from the government by virtue of their charters, and that it is the power of that government to repeal or revoke said charters; therefore be it

"Resolved, That we call upon the present committee of investigation appointed by congress to report such corporations as have by their conduct endangered the freedom of the institutions of our country.

"Resolved, That where the action of any corporation or company be found to be detrimental to the public interests and to the interest and pursuit of happiness of the individual, the charter of such company or corporation be immediately revoked.

"Resolved, By the citizens of New York, in mass meeting assembled, this 12th day of February, in the year 1888, in the Academy of Music, that we extend our moral sympathy to the miners now on strike and will assist them with all the material and financial aid within our power;

"Resolved, That we call upon our fellow citizens in every city of the United States to call similar mass meetings to render aid and assistance to the miners and their families.

"Resolved, That we call upon the press of the country to open lists of subscription in aid of the miners and railroad men.

"Resolved, That we appeal to a generous public, which has severely suffered from the coal famine, to render aid and assistance to the coal miners and use efforts to prevent the recurrence of similar circumstances in future years.

"Resolved, That the committee of arrangements be authorized to select a committee of business men to wait on Mr. Corbin and use their influence with a view to bringing about a settlement of this strike, which is so detrimental to the interests of the entire community.

Mr. John L. Lee of the strikers' committee gave a detailed explanation of the causes and progress of the coal miners' and railroad men's strike. He showed that Mr. Corbin had broken his agreement with the men, and was chiefly to blame for all the trouble. He considered it more of a lockout than a strike. There was more in it than the eight per cent advance. It was an attempt to crush out all organized labor. The Knights of L. or were against strikes. Strikes would never bring about a solution of the labor problem. They had a better weapon in the ballot, by which they could bring monopoly to terms. Landlordism was the creature of law, and if the people permitted it to exist it was their own fault. If they could receive aid enough to continue the strike for one month more, he felt satisfied their efforts would be crowned with success. (Applause.)

Mr. T. B. Maguire of the general executive committee of the Knights of Labor was the last speaker. He showed the intimate connection of the land question with the present trouble in the mining regions. The railroad question was next taken up, and he asked the people:

"How soon do you propose putting an end to this monopoly by putting into the hands of government the railroads of the country? (Great applause and cheers.) How long are you going to attend the big democratic and republican meetings before election time, where some loafer addresses you and they have a big band which plays, 'Hail to the thief'—chief, I mean. (Laughter.) Don't forget that it is you, the people, who are to blame. For 364 days in the year you are first-class members of labor organizations, but on the 365th you go up to the ballot box and vote my children and your children slaves to the capitalist. Let us come then from to night and resolve to do our share for the good of humanity." (Applause.)

Master Workman Quinn then thanked the audience for their magnificent demonstration and adjourned the meeting.

Henry George having been announced to speak wrote a letter to Mr. Croasdale, chairman of the executive committee, explaining

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

Benefit for the Striking Pennsylvania Coal Miners.

The forty-second public meeting of the Anti-poverty society was especially for the benefit of the strikers in the Pennsylvania coal regions and on the Reading railroad. Master Workman James E. Quinn of district assembly 49 presided, and with him on the platform were T. B. Maguire of the general executive board, Hugh Greenan, John L. Lee, Dr. McGlynn, James P. Archibald, W. T. Croasdale and others. Mr. Quinn said:

"The demonstration this evening in behalf of the coal miners and railroad men, through the courtesy of the Anti-poverty society, is for the purpose of placing before the public of New York an intelligent view of the difficulties by which the miners are surrounded. Workingmen are organized at the present time for something above the question of wages. Let the syndicates understand that it is not necessary under the present system of education in our labor organizations to have a college education in order to know what we are after in the shape of the entire control of all the natural elements by which we are surrounded (applause), that the labor organizations to-day are built on that one great principle which guarantees opportunity to every man, woman and child throughout the universe, and that is the land. (Applause.) A voice: 'And we will have it!' And if you will have it, workingmen of New York city and state, you must alter the course that you pursued in years gone by (applause), and see to it that you are not led off into the democratic or republican party. The first lesson that I was taught in labor organization is the fundamental principle of the organization of workingmen for the abolition of poverty off the face of the earth. (Applause.) It is therefore with the best of grace that we should meet in connection with the organization formed for the same purpose under the name of the Anti-poverty society. (Applause.)

Pennsylvania is in natural gifts a rich state, I am sometimes inclined to think for its area the richest state in the American Union—yet in the richest part of this rich state one may see men whose toil brings forth wealth from the bowels of the earth, reduced even in what are called good times to a scale of living but little above that of the poorest Irish peasant. I have traveled through many parts of this and other countries where the injustice of our treatment of land was strikingly apparent; but I know of no part of the world, not even excepting the poorest districts of Ireland, where the cause of poverty is so clearly revealed as it is in the mining districts of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania is in natural gifts a rich state, I am sometimes inclined to think for its area the richest state in the American Union—yet in the richest part of this rich state one may see men whose toil brings forth wealth from the bowels of the earth, reduced even in what are called good times to a scale of living but little above that of the poorest Irish peasant. I have traveled through many parts of this and other countries where the injustice of our treatment of land was strikingly apparent; but I know of no part of the world, not even excepting the poorest districts of Ireland, where the cause of poverty is so clearly revealed as it is in the mining districts of Pennsylvania.

"The above report was hastily prepared by those signing it for the morning papers, and there are several matters of detail that ought to be added. When Dr. McGlynn announced his appointment of new members he declared that his action was due to a desire, in view of recent events, to give the St. Stephen's parishioners a representation on the committee somewhat proportioned to their members and activity. It was this statement that called out Mr. Post's declaration of the fact known to every member of the committee, that Dr. McGlynn has been urged again and again to appoint some members of that parish on the committee and has persistently neglected to do so. The reason that the branch of the anti-poverty society that includes St. Stephen's parish was not organized weeks ago is that Dr. McGlynn, in order to avoid naming a chairman from among his old parishioners, has been negotiating with a Catholic gentleman in another parish to take the place. This explains the anger he displayed when Mr. Post stated the facts in the hearing of the new members.

The members who protested against the packing of the meeting do not deny that the by-laws give the power of appointment in the president's hands. The society was organized before Dr. McGlynn's excommunication and when his relations to the church were delicate and difficult. He strongly insisted that he would not speak every Sunday evening or do anything that would give it the appearance of a church. The power of appointment was therefore intrusted to him, as a guarantee that he should not be forced into any unpleasant position by any action of the executive committee. The society was very small at the time, but when its membership jumped from less than fifty to more than a thousand Dr. McGlynn was given power to add to the executive committee from time to time. There was probably not a single instance where he did not, before exercising this power, first consult with the members in a meeting at which a quorum of the committee was present. No one ever dreamed that Dr. McGlynn could become capable, through the mere apprehension that he might be censured, of using the power thus lodged in his hands to pack the committee in his own interest and on the open plea that his power was despotic and not even to be questioned. No self-respecting man could act in the committee under such conditions.

The meeting was then called to order and the reading of the minutes dispensed with, the following members being present: Gaybert Barnes, Dr. McGlynn, John MacMackin, Dr. Coughlin, A. J. Steers, Louis F. Post, Benjamin Urner, Dr. Edward O. Pentecost, T. L. McCready, Michael Clark, William T. Croasdale, Everett Glackin, Rev. John Ankele, William McCabe, John R. Waters, E. J. Shriver, Jerome O'Neil, James W. Sullivan, besides six of the new appointees. During the early part of the meeting several other new appointees came in, as did also some of the bona fide members of the committee, including Father Huntington, Dr. Gottheil, Edward Johnson, James O'Flaherty and James P. Archibald.

In view of the arbitrary action taken, Mr. Shriver moved that the president of the society be suspended for grave cause until a meeting of the society, in accordance with section 6 of the by-laws. The motion was seconded, and an excited debate followed.

In the course of this debate Mr. Post referred to the fact that various members of the committee had frequently urged upon Dr. McGlynn the appointment of some of the St. Stephen's parishioners. He was interrupted by Dr. McGlynn, who raised the point of order that his motives in making appointments could not be questioned, declaring that he "had despotic power" to appoint whomsoever he pleased. Before any ruling could be made John MacMackin raised the point of order that "the whole proceeding was out of order," but yielded to Gaybert Barnes, who made the point of order that the original motion was out of order, because the right of the president to appoint could not be questioned. The chair ruled that the committee had a right to call the president to account for improper exercise of his power and that the motion was in order.

Mr. Barnes appealed from the decision of the chair, declaring that the president had full power and that its exercise could not be questioned. The vote on the question of suspending the chair was taken by roll call, and as soon as all of the bona fide members had voted the chair announced that the decision was sustained without waiting for the call of the names of the strangers present claiming to be members. A motion was instantly made to adjourn, which, counting only the votes of the bona fide members, the chair declared carried. The undersigned thereupon left the room.

This is the culmination of a difficulty long standing in the committee. At the organization of the society the officers alone were elected and the president was given power to appoint the executive committee. This was done as a matter of courtesy to him and to avoid any chance of involving him in further difficulty with his ecclesiastical superiors.

Mr. McGlynn has uniformly opposed the appointment of members of St. Stephen's parish, or of ladies, to the committee, and for several months the holding of any public meetings of the society. A proposition to incorporate the society was referred to a committee consisting of Dr. McGlynn, chairman, Gaybert Barnes and William T. Croasdale as soon as it was discovered that it would be necessary to give the members of the society the right to vote for directors. This committee has never been called together, though one of its members, the chairman of the executive committee, was privately informed by the secretary of the society that "the matter of incorporation had been dropped."

Similar acts of arbitrary power have been frequent of late, but in all cases the committee has yielded to the dictation of Dr. McGlynn with a view to avoiding difficulty or dissension. A point has at last been reached however when this "despotic" rule has become intolerable; and as a majority of the bona fide members of the executive committee present at this evening's meeting we feel bound to lay this statement of facts before the society. We regret, as much as any of those members can, that this crisis has arisen, and we have made every effort to avoid it. Even during the excitement of the proceedings of this evening Mr. Sullivan suggested that the doctor's words at Pythagoras hall might have been hasty and asked him if he would

Yours very truly,
HENRY GEORGE.

A SERIOUS CRISIS.

THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY THREATENED WITH DISRUPTION.

The Executive Committee Packed—Many Members Withdraw on Account of Despotism—The Attacks on Mr. George.

The dissension and discontent that have for some time past threatened danger to the cause represented by the united labor party came to a head on Monday last in an unexpected manner, when a serious rupture took place in the executive committee of the Anti-poverty society. The meeting was the regular one, and no business of importance was to be transacted. There was, however, on the part of Dr. McGlynn, apprehension that the committee would take some action in relation to his recent attack on Mr. George, and by way of preventing any censure of his conduct he took the precaution to appoint ten or twelve new members of the committee before the meeting took place. The story of what followed will be found in the card below:

NEW YORK, Feb. 11, 1888.

W. T. Croasdale, Esq., Chairman Executive Committee of the Anti-Poverty Society—My Dear Sir: When first requested to speak on the anti-poverty society's platform to-morrow evening I was under the impression that I could do so, but I have found later that in order to keep a long standing engagement for Monday evening next I must leave town on Sunday morning instead of Sunday night, as I had supposed. Therefore, as I informed Mr. Michael Clark when he spoke of using my name in the advertisement, I must be contented with sending you a letter instead of making a speech which it would give me pleasure to make.

I am called on as a member of the anti-poverty society to express my sympathy with the striking miners of Pennsylvania. I do this without reference to any particular dispute that they may have with their employers, but on the general principle that they, like the working classes of our cities and of the country generally, belong to that great body of God's children who have been disinherited of any share in that great and rich estate which God, their maker, has provided for their use. I have traveled through many parts of this and other countries where the injustice of our treatment of land was strikingly apparent; but I know of no part of the world, not even excepting the poorest districts of Ireland, where the cause of poverty is so

some of whom had never attended a meeting in this room. The hostile intent of these men and their scheme to control the committee having been made manifest even in the newspapers, the president, Dr. McGlynn, in the best interests of the society and the exercise of his undoubted constitutional right, appointed several of the most active members and workers of the society to be members of the executive committee. The disaffected members at the meeting this evening showed their intent by endeavoring to get control of the committee, even going so far as to try to pass a vote of censure on Dr. McGlynn and to suspend him from his office.

"After some wrangling, finding they could not succeed, they retired in a body, and the committee then conducted the business in a quiet and orderly manner. The following gentlemen were dropped from the executive committee: Benjamin Urner, Edward J. Shriver, Louis F. Post, Thomas L. McCready, William T. Croasdale, Jerome O'Neill, the Rev. Hugh O. Peacock, William McCabe, A. J. Steers, Henry W. Sackett and J. W. Sullivan. Five of these were connected with **THE STANDARD**. In justice to Mr. Sackett it should be said that he was not at the meeting to-night, and that in dropping him from the committee we practically accepted his resignation, which was handed in a few days ago. The position of chairman of the executive committee, held by Mr. Croasdale, and of treasurer, held by Mr. Shriver, were filled by the unanimous election of Jeremiah Coughlin and Sylvester L. Malone."

In several respects it is difficult to see how this statement can be made to correspond with facts. All the members of the committee who retired and those who have since resigned have been on its roll for months, and, with two or three exceptions, were among the founders of the society. No election of officers is possible until the annual meeting of the full society in March. The doctor's statement of the intentions of members of the committee opposed to him is as far from being correct as are the reasons he gives for their opposition. The men from **THE STANDARD** whom he accuses of packing the meeting have been on the executive committee from the start, and the only one who had not attended the meetings in room 30 was McCready, whose reasons for not doing so are given in another column. Mr. Sullivan had not been at a meeting in perhaps six weeks, as, though not a Catholic, he disapproved of Dr. McGlynn's indiscriminate attacks on the Catholic church and his making the anti-poverty platform a vehicle for airing his personal grievances and diverting the land reform movement to one of hostility toward men whose sympathies might be won for the movement. It is true that Mr. Sackett sent in a letter of resignation some time ago, on the ground that he was unable to attend the meetings, but it is also true that his resignation was declined by letter. Thus Dr. McGlynn is put in the position of accusing the regular working members of the committee of packing a meeting to which he called fifteen men, never before connected with the committee. The members of the committee whose names were on the roll at the previous weekly meeting stand as follows: With Dr. McGlynn—Messrs. McMackin, Coughlin, Michael Clarke, Barnes and O'Flaherty. Messrs. Archibald and Whoriskey arrived at the meeting late and remained with Dr. McGlynn's friends, Mr. Archibald saying he wished to know more about the matter before taking final action. Mr. Edward Johnson also remained, though he had refrained from voting to support Dr. McGlynn on the test question. Opposed to Dr. McGlynn's action are Hugh O. Pentecost, Rev. J. O. S. Huntington, Rev. John Ankettell, Benjamin Urner, A. J. Steers, John Waters, E. J. Shriver, Everett Glackin, Charles F. Wingate, H. W. Sackett, W. T. Croasdale, Louis F. Post, T. L. McCready, William McCabe and J. W. Sullivan. The absentees were Messrs. Carr, Cranford, Redpath, W. B. Clarke, Henry George and J. V. George.

Comments of the Press.

Dr. McGlynn objects to a despot in Russia, but he doesn't at all object to a despot in the anti-poverty society. He could be the despot. After all, there is a good deal of human nature in most men.—*Tribune*.

The good Dr. McGlynn is showing himself to be "no slouch" of a politician.—*World*.

Whether any one will blame the doctor depends upon whether he regards him as an inspired saint, as a straightforward example of the divine nature. The way he is thought of in the latter light will not be surprised at the facility with which Mr. George's followers were left. Probably Dr. McGlynn himself would say that the view of these latter observers was correct.—*Sun*.

Politicians, as we have often said, are, as a rule, honorable and fair in their transactions; but when novices undertake to reform the world, by the propagation of cretches through the action of volunteer committees, they are very apt to find themselves descending to methods that the educated self-control and well defined rules of established political organizations preclude. This has proved less true of various ephemeral "citizen" associations during recent years than it now does of the "anti-poverty" experiment.—*Star*.

Two Members of the Executive Committee Resign.

Rev. John Ankettell writes as follows:

New York, Feb. 14.—I have just mailed to the secretary my resignation as the chairman of the central branch and member of the executive committee anti-poverty society.

J. ANKETTELL

Mr. Charles F. Wingate also informs **THE STANDARD** that he has sent to the president a brief but emphatic resignation from the executive committee.

HOW IT ALL BEGAN.

Last week an attack, manifestly prepared, was made on Henry George with a view to making effective here in New York a campaign of slander that has been actively carried on by mail for some months. The reports appearing in the city papers are here reprinted in order to afford our readers throughout the world the fullest knowledge of the series of events that culminated in the rupture in the executive committee of the anti-poverty society on Monday evening.

The Attack in Brooklyn.

The united labor general committee of Kings county met in Everett hall, No. 386 Fulton street, Brooklyn, last night, with Victor A. Wilder in the chair. John J. Clancy, who ran for mayor on the united labor ticket, offered a resolution calling for a conference of delegates from the various labor organizations of the county, with a view to united political action in the future, which was adopted.

Mr. Wilder then left the chair, which was taken by John H. Edelman of the Tenth ward, and the former moved the following resolution:

That this committee still keeps in view and adopts as its principles the political reforms embodied in the declaration made in convention of the united labor party at Syracuse in August, 1887.

Resolved. That at the time of the adoption

of this platform the present issue of free trade and protection was fully understood, and as it was the deliberate act of that convention in refusing to take sides upon the question, we but reaffirm the position then taken in declaring that we refuse to be diverted from the fundamental issues of that platform by now dividing upon the lines of a tariff or no tariff issue. The fundamental issues on which we could contest for political supremacy were then plainly stated and we now denounce the effort to force the party to proceed on the lines or to disband. We have nothing to do with free trade, protection or tariff, notwithstanding that as more and more in the interest, and we do not make the effort now being made to make it appear that we are essentially a free trade or protective party. We are neither. We are for land reform.

"I am a protectionist," said Mr. Wilder, in supporting the resolution. "Mr. George has declared that he and others were going for free trade and Cleveland, but I, who am an out and out protectionist, will vote against Blaine if he be a candidate and will support the labor ticket—the united labor party. (Applause.) While according to Henry George due credit for honesty of principle and sincerity of purpose, he must not be allowed to escape responsibility for his acts or words. We must take a decided stand in this matter, and never forget the principles of our party, which have nothing to do with the issue Mr. George is raising."

In answering an attack later on, Mr. Wilder said:

"The resolution says nothing about Henry George, but I personally denounce him with all my force for his efforts to split what promises to be a magnificent party in twain."

Mr. J. O. C. Hennessy opposed the resolution. He said that Mr. Wilder misunderstood the scope of the opinions expressed by Mr. George in an interview with a newspaper, and condemned hasty action.

John J. Clancy spoke in favor of the resolution. He said if it was Mr. Cleveland Henry George wanted, he had him already. He was president of the United States already, and Mr. George should be happy.

"I am a democrat," said Mr. Clancy, "and have been one, but I know it was the saviors of society belonging to that party that traduced us and Mr. George and called us communists. I believe Henry George is going into the democratic party, but he does not take me with him—(cheers)—and I doubt other ex-democrats like myself will go into the Cleveland ring to please Henry George. While he remains a united labor man we are with him, but we decline to form a tail for him when he severs his connection and marches into the democratic camp. (Applause.)

"I suggest," said Mr. Clancy, in conclusion, "that the labor men of New York oppose the democrats in this state and to the labor men of Pennsylvania to defeat the republicans. Henry George as a theorist is honest and successful, but as a political leader he is, perhaps, the greatest failure of the age we live in."

John Keenan of the Twentieth ward, said Henry George was right; it was no use in going into a national campaign; they should stick to state issues.

John H. Edelman of the Sixth ward spoke against the resolution. He said Mr. George in the sun commits no one but Henry George.

Mr. Delany supported the resolution. He said it did not matter a straw whether protection or free trade obtains in so far as the workingman is concerned. He did not believe in Mr. George's idea of action in the state and being passive in national affairs. Let Mr. George retire from the party if he pleases—he has a right to do so.

After a heated discussion a vote was taken, with the following result: In favor of the resolution, 36; opposed, 18.

ANOTHER REPORT.

Daily News, Feb. 8.

There was uproar for nearly three hours last night at the meeting of the Kings county general committee of the united labor party over a resolution introduced by Victor A. Wilder which, without mentioning Henry George's name, censured him for expressing his opinion that the party should not go into a national campaign this year.

Mr. Wilder is an ex-republican and admirer of Mr. Blaine, and last night vigorously declared that he was a protectionist and that the party over a resolution introduced by Victor A. Wilder which, without mentioning Henry George's name, censured him for expressing his opinion that the party should not go into a national campaign this year.

Mr. Wilder, and last night vigorously declared that he was a protectionist and that the party over a resolution introduced by Victor A. Wilder which, without mentioning Henry George's name, censured him for expressing his opinion that the party should not go into a national campaign this year.

John J. Clancy, who ran for mayor in Brooklyn last fall, and who last night declared there ought to be a union of the socialists, union labor party and every other labor party, also denounced Mr. George, who he said was trying to lead the united labor party into the democratic camp.

Gabriel Barnes, while professing excessive friendship for Mr. George, saying that he had slept in the same bed with him on one occasion, dealt his friend some very hard blows.

Mr. Barnes was asked to express an opinion he said that Mr. George could not take a corporal's guard away from the united labor party, and that the party was not the personal property of any one. He thought that the party would be benefited, for, with the tariff question on one side, the party could unite with the union labor party in the west and nominate a national ticket.

This statement was received in amazement by the meeting, but Mr. Barnes showed himself to be a good hand at remarkable statements in the next breath, when he said:

"What do we nominate him for mayor of New York for but to spread the light on the land question? I know this is so, because I can tell you that if it hadn't been for me he would never have been nominated."

C. O. Hennessy, John H. Edelman, John Keenan and others fought hard against the resolution, and finally tried hard to stave off action until the ward associations could be heard from, but Mr. Wilder's friends were in a majority, and cheered lustily as the resolution was passed by a vote of 36 to 22.

Mr. Barnes's Explanation.

Daily News, Feb. 2.

Sir: I beg space to say a few words in relation to your report of Tuesday night's meeting of the Kings county general committee of the united labor party.

Our informant colors his report when he says I "professed excessive friendship" for Mr. George. I said merely this: That Mr. George and I had been intimate friends for years, that I had supped and slept with him, and might, therefore, be expected to know him well, to be familiar with the whole course of the united labor party movement and to speak advisedly of both.

If my assertion that but for me Mr. George would not have been a candidate for the mayoralty of New York is, as your report calls it, "amazing" or "remarkable," it is, nevertheless, true. It was my good fortune to be able to frustrate the anxious endeavors of the democrats to side-track Mr. George by a congressional nomination in 1886, giving, for Mr. George, an absolute and final negative to that proposition when it was made to me by the agent, whom I met at their joint request.

It is true that Mr. John H. Edelman spoke against Mr. Wilder's resolutions, but it is also true that he voted in their favor, stating that my remarks had given him some new light.

The resolutions were adopted, not, as your report has it, thirty-six to twenty-two, but by a vote of thirty-six to eighteen, and several who voted in the negative told me that they did so only from reluctance to publish to the

world what Mr. George is publishing in his paper every week. GABRIEL BARNES, Secretary State Committee United Labor Party.

AN INTERVIEW WITH HIM.

New York Herald, Feb. 10.

Several versions of Mr. Barnes's remarks have been published, and in speaking of the matter yesterday he made the following statement:

"The report of my remarks, as made in an evening paper, contained colorings and inaccuracies which I have partially corrected in a published letter. These colorings may be accounted for by the fact that a member of the general committee who opposed Mr. Wilder's resolution is attached to the evening paper referred to. It had been declared that the resolutions were 'a slap in the face for Henry George.' This, when I took the floor, I disclaimed, stating that I had been an intimate friend of Mr. George, had eaten, drunk, slept and worked with him, and therefore knew him well, and was closely familiar with all the matters of which I was about to speak. None of the statements of fact made by me in the course of my remarks have been contradicted; but I said some things that have not been reported, and that it may be worth while to repeat.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth; that it is the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest.

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe the united labor party off the face of the earth;

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at

23 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, \$25; six months, \$12.50; single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the Post-Office, New York, as second class

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient postage is sent for return postage. No notice will be given of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD. All communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every postoffice in the United States, to whom remunerative terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Single copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Saturday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

PLATFORM OF THE UNITED LABOR PARTY.

Adopted at Syracuse August 19, 1887.

We, the delegates of the united labor party of New York, in convention assembled, hereby reassert, as the fundamental basis of the party, the principle on which we ask the cooperation of citizens of other states, the following declaration of principles adopted on September 23, 1884, by the convention of trade and labor associations of the city of New York, that resulted in the formation of the united labor party.

Holding that the corruptions of government and the impoverishment of labor result from neglect of the self-evident truths proclaimed by the founders of the republic, that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator withinalinal rights, a right to the abolition of a system which compels men to pay their fellow creatures for the use of God's gifts to all, and permits monopolies to deprive labor of natural opportunities for employment, thus filling the world with idleness and pauperism, and creating an unnatural competition which tends to reduce wages to starvation rates and to make the wealth producer the industrial slave of those who grow rich by his toil.

Holding, moreover, that the advantages arising from social growth and improvement in society, as well as from the simplification of the system, will make such beneficial inventions as the railroad and telegraph a means for the suppression of the people and the aggrandizement of an aristocracy of wealth and power. We declare that the purpose of government to be the protection of the people, and that the only way which gives to every one opportunity to employ his labor and security in it, he shall enjoy its fruits; to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, and the unscrupulous from robbing the honest; and to do for the equal benefit of all others as can be bettered by organized society, that all may have an equal share in the benefits of all laws which give to any class of citizens advantages, either judicial, financial, industrial or political, that are not equally shared by all others.

We call upon all who seek the emancipation of labor, and who would make the American union and its component states democratic commonwealths of really free and independent citizens, to ignore all minor differences and join with us in organizing a great national general government, in which all men shall have equal rights and justice. We do not aim at securing a general equality in the distribution of wealth. We do not propose that the state shall attempt to control production, conduct distribution, or in any wise interfere with the freedom of the individual to use his labor or capital in any way that may seem proper to him and that will not interfere with the equal rights of others. Nor do we propose that the state shall take possession of land and either work it or rent it out. What we propose is not the disturbing of any man in his holding or title, but by abolishing all taxes on industry or its products, to leave to the producer the full fruits of his exertion and by the taxation of land values, exclusive of improvements, to devote to the common use and benefit those values, which, arising not from the exertion of the individual, but from the growth of society, belong justly to the community as a whole. This increased taxation of land, not according to its area, but according to its value, will relieve the working man and small business owner of the tax burdens now imposed upon them. Make it impossible to hold land for speculation, and thus throw open abundant opportunities for the employment of labor and the building up of homes.

While thus simplifying government by doing away with the hoards of officials required by the present system of taxation and with its incentives to fraud and corruption, we would further promote the common weal and further secure the equal rights of all, by placing under public control such agencies as are in their nature monopolies. We would have our municipalities supply their inhabitants with water, light and heat; we would have the general government issue all money, without the intervention of banks; we would add a postal telegraph system and postal savings banks to the postal service, and would assume public control and ownership of those other roads which have become the highways of commerce.

While declining the following to be the fundamental principles and aims of the united labor party, and while conscious that no reform can give effect and permanent relief to labor that does not involve the legal recognition of equal rights to natural opportunities, we nevertheless, as measures of relief from some of the evils effects of ignoring these rights, favor such legislation as may tend to reduce the hours of labor, to prevent the employment of children of tender years, to avoid the competition of convict labor with honest industry, to secure the sanitary inspection of tenements, factories and mines, and to put an end to the abuse of conspiracy laws.

We desire also to so simplify the procedure of our courts and diminish the expense of legal proceedings, that the poor may be placed on an equality with the rich and the long delays which now result in scandalous miscarriages of justice may be prevented.

And that the labor party may be organized for the adoption of what is known as the "Australian system of voting," we declare that the effectual success of the ballot and the relief of candidates for public office from the heavy expenses now imposed upon them, may prevent bribery and intimidation, do away with practical discriminations in favor of the rich and unscrupulous, and lessen the pernicious influence of money in politics.

In support of these aims we solicit the co-operation of all patriotic citizens who, sick of the degradation of politics, desire by constitutional methods to establish justice, to preserve liberty, to extend the spirit of humanity, and to elevate humanity.

THE UNVARNISHED TRUTH.

Recent evidences of differences between prominent members of the united labor party in this city have caused general regret among friends of the movement everywhere and profound sorrow to many of those immediately concerned. A desire to avoid an open rupture has caused many warmly devoted to the principles of the party to maintain silence, even under misrepresentation and abuse. The time has come, however, when the interests of the cause demand that the truth shall be plainly told.

In order to understand the situation we must go back to the early days of the party in this city. The organization accepted its defeat in 1886 as a great moral victory. It held a mass meeting to celebrate that victory in Cooper union on November 6. At that jubilee meeting it was resolved that steps should immediately be taken to begin the formation of a national party to represent the principles of the Clarendon hall platform. A resolution was adopted by acclamation ap-

pointing John McMackin, Rev. Edward McGlynn, D.D., and Professor David B. Scott a central committee for the purpose. This committee organized with Dr. McGlynn as chairman and it employed Gaybert Barnes as secretary and established itself at No. 28 Cooper union. Professor Scott withdrew from the committee.

Mr. Barnes devised a scheme of organizing land and labor clubs throughout the country, and thought that a charge of \$5 for a charter followed by a small per capita tax on the members would bring in a fund that would meet the expenses of the committee. This hope was not realized, and it has long been an open secret that the expenses of room 28 have been met out of the pocket of Dr. McGlynn, aided by the receipts of such lectures as he has delivered for pay. This central committee had no jurisdiction over the united labor party in New York city, and drew its only authority from the mass meeting held after the election in 1886. Nevertheless, some members of the county committee of the united labor party claimed the right to exercise some measure of supervision over the committee, and a formidable movement to attack Mr. Barnes was threatened by A. A. Levey, esq., and others in the county committee early in 1887. Mr. McMackin, who was also chairman of that committee, sat down on this effectively by refusing to recognize the member who proposed making the motion. After the withdrawal of Professor Scott, James Redpath was chosen by the other members to fill the vacancy, but he has been an invalid ever since his appointment and his attendance at its meetings has always been irregular. Practically the committee consisted of Dr. McGlynn, John McMackin and last, but by no means least, Gaybert Barnes. These gentlemen considered it astonishing impudence on the part of the united labor party of New York city to make any attempt to inquire into their affairs, since that party contributed nothing to the support of this "land and labor committee."

When the time came for calling a state convention the county committees of New York and Kings invited the land and labor committee to join with them in the call, and agreed with it as to the representation in the convention of the land and labor clubs it had organized in the state of New York. The socialists, after they were ousted, complained that this committee had used its authority to pack the convention against them, but an examination of the votes will show that they got more support from those brought into the convention by this committee than they received from New York and Brooklyn.

The convention met at Syracuse on Aug. 17, 1887, and remained in session three days. It adopted the present platform of the party and nominated a full state ticket, headed by Henry George for secretary of state. Mr. George strenuously objected to becoming a candidate, and Dr. McGlynn insisted that it was his duty to accept. Finally, yielding to the unanimous demand of the convention, Mr. George accepted, and Dr. McGlynn being loudly called for, mounted the platform and said:

I am not here to congratulate our leader, our teacher and our apostle upon the unanimous nomination by this convention for the highest office for which the people of this state are to vote in the coming election. It is no matter of congratulation with Mr. George except in the sense in which we might congratulate a martyr whom we had seen going smiling on, tenacious of his purpose, to the stake or to the block. (Applause.) I think I know the man whom you in placing in nomination have thereby exceedingly honored yourselves. I think I know him as well as any other man knows him, and I know that there is no selfish spot in that heart of his. (Applause.) I know that if it ever were true of a man it is true of him, that whatsoever office man could hold in this world, if he shall ever hold it, the office will have to seek him.

Among the resolutions adopted by the convention, but forming no part of the platform, was the following:

Whereas, At a conference of members of the united labor party of the states of Ohio and Indiana, held in Cincinnati on July 4, resolutions were adopted urging the central land and labor committee to take steps for calling a national conference; therefore, be it

Resolved, That, in view of the near approach of the national contest, this convention joins with our brethren of the west in requesting the chairman of our state committee to co-operate with the land and labor committee to issue a call for a national conference of such organizations of citizens of other states as may be disposed to act with the united labor party of New York, in forming a national party.

In the course of the proceedings a communication was received from a committee representing the union labor party asking a conference. It was received with a storm of hisses and laid on the table without reading, and it was with great difficulty that this motion was reconsidered. The communication was then read and the chairman of the convention, John McMackin, was directed to return it to those from whom it emanated with the information that the united labor party refused to treat with them.

Before adjournment the convention elected a state committee. After the convention adjourned this committee met and elected J. H. Blakeney chairman and Gaybert Barnes secretary. At the same time it chose an executive committee consisting of Dr. Edward McGlynn, John McMackin and Hugh Whorisky of New York, and Victor A. Wilder and Gaybert Barnes of Brooklyn, and since that time the state committee has held but one meeting.

The executive committee organized by electing Dr. McGlynn chairman and treasurer and Gaybert Barnes secretary, and it established its headquarters at room 28 Cooper union, hiring the adjoining room during the campaign for clerks. This committee managed the canvass of 1887. It will be noted that Dr. McGlynn, John McMackin and Gaybert Barnes, who practically constitute the land and labor committee, also constitute a majority of the matter,

executive committee. There was much grumbling about the close corporation character of the party's management and at the failure of those concerned to consult with any other members of the party. Henry George, though the head of the ticket, was not consulted as to the management of the campaign, and the state committee was ignored.

Some time after the disastrous defeat of last year a correspondence began in the columns of THE STANDARD as to the expediency of entering the national canvass. At about the same time Henry George delivered in the Academy of Music, at the joint invitation of the Seventh assembly district and the executive committee of the anti-poverty society, an address on the president's tariff message. Mr. George warmly commended this message as a step, however short, in the right direction. Dr. McGlynn was present and made a few remarks commendatory of Mr. George's speech. Up to that time there was little thought apparently of a national ticket, and Dr. McGlynn was strongly in favor of changing the name of the party.

Suddenly there was a change of sentiment in room 28, and Mr. Barnes began to openly lament that the labor party was cursed with such leadership as that of Henry George, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. George had for a long time been excluded from all share in the management of the party. There were strong hints that Mr. George was going over to the democrats. The great importance of retaining the word "labor" in the party's name was urged, and any declaration for or against free trade in a national platform was deprecated. At last, a few weeks ago, Mr. George, after a previous talk with Dr. McGlynn, was invited to come to room 28 and bring some friends with him. He invited Louis F. Post, James W. Sullivan and Wm. T. Croasdale to accompany him, and Dr. McGlynn, John McMackin and Gaybert Barnes were found there. An informal conversation followed. There was no objection made by any one present to the calling of the national conference provided for by the Syracuse resolutions.

There was comparatively little talk as to the expediency of nominating a national ticket, though that subject was considered. The main discussion was as to the propriety or possibility of making a national platform without some declaration on the subject of the tariff. Finally, Dr. McGlynn asked Mr. George if he would not be satisfied with the Syracuse platform in a national canvas. Mr. George said he would not without the addition of a plank relating to the tariff, which nothing could now stop from becoming a national issue. This is the remark which Mr. Barnes has since perverted in his declaration that Mr. George had said to him that he would not support a candidate running on the united labor platform.

The discussion was inconclusive, and finally Mr. Post asked Mr. Barnes what they proposed to do. Mr. Barnes replied that they would go right on and call a convention and nominate a ticket. Mr. Post asked where that would leave those who had not yet made up their minds as to the expediency of nominating a ticket. Mr. Barnes replied that they would be left out, that no one opposed to the object of the convention "had" any business in it. This proposal to leave out Messrs. George, Post and others on the mere dictum of three men in room 28 excited the ire of Mr. Croasdale, and he told them that they had no right or authority to take such action. The Syracuse resolution provided for calling a conference, not a convention, and the representatives of the party from all parts of the country must attend that conference and decide for themselves as to whether a convention should be held, and it was not in the power of those gathered in that room to decide such an important question in advance.

Mr. Barnes and Dr. McGlynn objected to the great expense of two national gatherings, and Mr. Post said there need not be two. If the conference decided on nominations it could turn itself into a convention and nominate candidates. The question of expense being thus brought up, the talk turned in that direction, and Mr. Barnes remarked that it would only be necessary to make a vigorous campaign in those states that were "anybody's states." On being asked to name them, he replied Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Indiana. The remark was then made by some one that that would be obviously a campaign in the high tariff division, which has kept so many of them from seeing the true cause of the evils that beset them. Mr. George and his friends want the party held together on local lines, leaving its members individually free in the national contest; and, knowing all they do, they believe that thus, and thus only, can corrupt alliances with one or the other of the two old parties be prevented.

While those denouncing him have plotted in secret. He has never proposed that the united labor party shall indorse or assist the democratic candidates, while his accusers have deliberately planned to run it in the interest of the republicans. Hoping the foolish scheme originated by Secretary-General Barnes would fall through, Mr. George has silently submitted to secret misrepresentation rather than take the initiative in provoking a rupture that every friend of the principles enunciated in the Syracuse platform will deplore. Now that the open charge has come, Mr. George is bound to speak, and in justice to him and to the cause that he above all others represents, the truth must be told.

Let the hasty and ill-informed who are swift to judge without knowledge ask themselves a few questions.

Have any three men, however good and great, the right to sit in room 28, Cooper Union, and, without advice or consultation with others, to speak and act for the united labor party of this city and state?

Have those three men any right to refuse to speedily call a conference to settle just such questions?

Remembering the treatment of the socialists and union labor men at Syracuse, would it not be a usurpation of power without parallel for these three men to attempt to join the united labor party with the platform of the party?

Have those three men any right to refuse to speedily call a conference to settle just such questions?

Remembering the treatment of the socialists and union labor men at Syracuse, would it not be a usurpation of power without parallel for these three men to attempt to join the united labor party with the platform of the party?

Let honest men who have sense as well as enthusiasm stop their paroxysmal howl about the importance of maintaining a great principle by a national canvass long enough to think over these questions and calmly answer them, and then they may begin to see that the man who taught them the land doctrine, and who was so recently saluted by Dr. McGlynn as "our leader, our teacher and our apostle," in whose heart "there is no selfish spot," has again been "going smiling on, tenacious of his purpose," though wounded in his tenderest affections, seeking, without scandal, to save the party he has twice led from going down in everlasting infamy amidst the jeering ridicule that overwhelmed the Butler fiasco four years ago.

Let our friends throughout the country remember this: Mr. George and his friends have never for a moment opposed the calling of a conference of representatives to decide the question of the nomination and all other questions, but they have insisted that no three or more men in this city shall decide so important a question. They have never advocated the main discussion was as to the propriety or possibility of making a national platform without some declaration on the subject of the tariff. Finally, Dr. McGlynn asked Mr. George if he would not be satisfied with the Syracuse platform in a national canvas. Mr. George said he would not without the addition of a plank relating to the tariff, which nothing could now stop from becoming a national issue. This is the remark which Mr. Barnes has since perverted in his declaration that Mr. George had said to him that he would not support a candidate running on the united labor platform.

The discussion was inconclusive, and finally Mr. Post asked Mr. Barnes what they proposed to do. Mr. Barnes replied that they would go right on and call a convention and nominate a ticket. Mr. Post asked where that would leave those who had not yet made up their minds as to the expediency of nominating a ticket. Mr. Barnes replied that they would be left out, that no one opposed to the object of the convention "had" any business in it. This proposal to leave out Messrs. George, Post and others on the mere dictum of three men in room 28 excited the ire of Mr. Croasdale, and he told them that they had no right or authority to take such action. The Syracuse resolution provided for calling a conference, not a convention, and the representatives of the party from all parts of the country must attend that conference and decide for themselves as to whether a convention should be held, and it was not in the power of those gathered in that room to decide such an important question in advance.

I called upon Dr. McGlynn for an explanation at the earliest possible moment, meeting him by appointment in the hallway of Cooper union, after the close of a meeting which he had been addressing.

It seems to me, permit me to say, extremely unfortunate that Mr. Barnes should have forced this matter to such an issue by making the statement relating to yourself, and adding that he himself, and he was very sure Mr. McMackin also, would resign from the committee if the motion prevailed.

I would request to

To my astonishment Dr. McGlynn denounced women in general as chatterboxes, "who were always shooting off their mouths," and as unfit for such positions;

and in particular he spoke abusively of

one of the women whom he himself had appointed, urging as a crowning reason

for rescinding her appointment, that her husband had spoken disrespectfully of Mr. Barnes.

I ought perhaps to have brought matters to a head at once by making a statement to the executive committee and demanding that action be taken. I blame myself now that I did not. But I foresaw that such a course would involve the ruin of the society and I indulged the hope that Dr. McGlynn's resentment against the shameful alliance between the democratic and ecclesiastical machines in this city, but even this is not sufficient to make them assistant republicans for the sake of putting some such man as Chauncey Depew in the White house, and still further confirming foolish workingmen in the high tariff division, which has kept so many of them from seeing the true cause of the evils that beset them. Mr. George and his friends want the party held together on local lines, leaving its members individually free in the national contest; and, knowing all they do, they believe that thus, and thus only, can corrupt alliances with one or the other of the two old parties be prevented.

WM. T. CROASDALE,

LOUIS F. POST,

J. W. SULLIVAN.

THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

There are certain matters connected with the formation and history of the Anti-poverty society regarding which it seems to me desirable that the readers of THE STANDARD should be informed.

After Dr. McGlynn had been expelled from the pastorale of St. Stephen's in January, 1887, and while he was still confined to his house by the illness which followed that expulsion, it occurred to me that the doctor's announced purpose to devote his life to the furtherance of the cause of industrial emancipation would be largely aided if there could be organized a society devoted to the advocacy of the religious principle involved in the doctrine of the single tax—the principle of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man—as distinguished from the purely economic principle. Having sufficiently matured my ideas I submitted them first to Henry George and Louis F. Post, and next to Dr. McGlynn, and finally, on March 26, to a meeting of a few gentlemen at the office of THE STANDARD. The result was the formation of the Anti-poverty society, the name being of my selection.

Between the organizing meeting on March 26 and the first public meeting at Chickering hall on May 1, weekly meetings of the society were held, at which plans of action were discussed. Although none of us anticipated the marvelous success which the society actually achieved, we all felt confidence in its future, and were anxious to surround it with safeguards which might prevent its being "sidetracked" from its original purpose.

Dr. McGlynn, who had been chosen

president of the society, pointed out to us that as soon as the society should commence its public career there would be an immediate influx of members from St. Stephen's parish. He desired above all things to avoid doing anything that might look like the founding of a new church, and to be assured that the society would do nothing which might further complicate his already very complicated relations with the Roman Catholic church. It was felt by the members of the society that if the election of the executive committee were left to the society, the zeal of the new members from St. Stephen's might outrun their discretion, with the effect of placing Dr. McGlynn in an embarrassing position.

Now that the open charge has come, Mr. George is bound to speak, and in justice to him and to the cause that he above all others represents, the truth must be told.

his own arbitrary authority. I thought I saw from this and other indications that the Anti-poverty society would be diverted from its independent work of propagating the reforms which we advocated and become a mere annex to a political machine of which Dr. McGlynn and Messrs. Mackin and Barnes were the manipulators, and that it would not accord with my sense of duty or self respect to become a mere tool to carry out purposes the honesty of which I suspected. I therefore determined that unless the members of the committee would rouse themselves to the necessity of throwing off the things which were making for evil, I would resign my office. While waiting, in hope and expectancy that the society would be incorporated, many things conspired to annoy me in the conduct of my important office. Among these were Dr. McGlynn's utter incompetency in business matters. Remittances sent to him directly were not immediately reported, and in one or more instances were not reported at all, causing much inquiry and correspondence. I am far from charging any dishonesty upon the doctor in this matter; the difficulty, as I fully believe, grew out of his carelessness. His inattention to the clerical duties of his office, such as delay in signing certificates of membership, was another cause of annoyance. But all these things could have been very easily endured had I not been convinced of a constant tendency, in the use of its funds and in other ways, to make the society more and more a mere machine to carry out nominally political objects, but really to carry out the purposes of a few parties, which I believed to be entirely selfish. In resigning as treasurer I retained my membership in the committee, thinking that a time might come when that membership might prove of use to the cause, and the events of last evening, in which I had a very minor participation, in forcing the evil element in the society to fully display itself, justify the wisdom of that course.

BENJ. URNER.

ANXIOUS MERCHANTS.

The merchants of New York seem to many to be men to be envied. They live luxuriously and appear to regard this as the best of all possible worlds. They are almost fanatical upholders of the existing conditions and look with either alarm or contempt on the discontent of labor. Yet it is a question if they have any better reason than the working people to be satisfied with the political and business situation. The "trust," that gigantic menace to all private business and individual enterprise, looms up to add terror to the care that already oppresses thousands of them. No matter what may be their disposition they find themselves forced to leave the old and beaten paths and to enter more or less the field of speculation. Many of them are constantly on the ragged edge alternating between high hope and utter despair.

Here is a case that is largely typical: An apparently successful merchant needs \$20,000 in order that he may extend his business in a perfectly legitimate way. He sends for a broker and tells him that he wants \$20,000 on single name paper. That is, the merchant proposes to put out promissory notes drawn to his own order and indorsed by himself. This is a common method of borrowing money in this city, and if the house be a solvent one of fair reputation the broker probably reports that he can get the money at eight per cent per annum and his own commission of one-eighth of one per cent. If the merchant wants these notes renewed at the end of three or four months he can probably extend the loan at the same rate. He may be earning far more than this on his investment. He will probably make two and one-half per cent on his goods and turn over his capital eight times a year. Under such circumstances he can well afford to pay eight per cent for all the money he needs, and his manifest prosperity makes it easy to obtain it. Under such circumstances his bills payable account would probably increase rather than diminish.

In course of time there comes to such a man a period of stagnation in business, or perhaps rivals, by more pushing methods, cut into his trade. Instead of borrowing money because he can make a good profit on it over and above the interest he pays, he now has urgent need of a loan to meet maturing obligations for goods on hand and worth what they have cost, but at present unsaleable without a great sacrifice. He sends for his broker again, but that individual is not so cheerfully confident. He says: "Mr. Blank, you have \$60,000 adrift on this market, and I greatly fear that I cannot float any more of your single name paper at eight per cent." He comes back presently and declares that twelve per cent is the best he can do. The merchant had better pay that than submit to the loss of forcing his goods in the market.

If there is now a turn for the better and prices rise the goods will probably go off, the new rates be met and the merchant, himself, will have no hesitation in telling a story that at such a time a certain fall in prices caught him so badly that he actually had to pay twelve per cent; but if things do not change the case is different. He will have to renew this last loan at twelve per cent. His credit fails to that measure and he must pay twelve per cent on all his other loans, and money is harder to get than it was when he paid but eight per cent. Unless there is a speedy change or the better his credit will fall lower still. The merchant begins to be talked over by money lenders. Some one holding a paper goes to one of the lenders who

take big risks for big profits and asks what he will give for \$10,000 of Mr. Blank's paper. The answer is probably eighteen per cent off. The holder thinks Blank will do better than that himself, and probably, if alarmed, offers it to him at fifteen. Blank cannot take it then, but sends for his broker to borrow \$10,000 at any rate he can under fifteen per cent. And so the process goes on until Blank must pay eighteen per cent a year for ever dollar he borrows. After this has gone on for a little time he is compelled to "make a statement." His creditors look through his affairs so that they can judge for themselves the risk that they are taking, and they either force a suspension or help the man through. They wish to help him through if possible, for their money is at stake.

Nor is this situation, fraught with care and anxiety, confined to the merchants whose capital has been impaired. Twenty years ago two young men had a business, partly manufacturing and partly mercantile. They enjoyed wonderful prosperity, and in a single year made \$68,000 profits on a capital of \$70,000. Of course others were promptly attracted into the business, and though their trade doubled during the following five years, they did not make during the whole period as much profit as they had made in that single lucky year. Then came another good time, and though profits did not proportionately increase, the demand necessitated the erection of a costly factory building. The firm was a prosperous one, but it was now more difficult for it to make a profit of \$15,000 on a capital of \$165,000 than it had previously been to make \$68,000 on \$70,000.

Trade was good, but the cost of doing business was greater. The new building and more costly plant increased rent and taxes. Rivalry demanded of the firm new efforts to keep their own goods before the public. Thousands of dollars were spent in advertising and in the employment of traveling salesmen. The business continued to grow, but so did the necessity for its growth. The partners had to keep an eye on the market. A corner in certain metals would seriously affect their business. They had to buy largely of such metals in anticipation of a rise. The same was true of certain other raw materials. They could, of course, have bought for future delivery in the market, but a future bought of a broker who might burst would not meet their wants. At the right season they must have their raw material in their factory at any cost, or cease to do business. They were a solid firm with a large capital, yet exigencies like these might cause them to become large borrowers. If prices of materials thus bought remained high they would make money, but if they fell their smaller rivals in trade who bought materials as they needed them would undersell them because of this fall. It would be easy to imagine conditions under which such a firm might have to pay unreasonable prices for a renewal of its paper, and thereby be led into the difficulties first described.

This is no fancy sketch. A majority of the business men of New York pass through such experiences several times in their career, and an enormous proportion of them are never out of difficulty. The matters claiming their attention become more complex from year to year, and the drain of rent and interest is continuous, the former ever increasing and the latter constantly fluctuating. It is very doubtful if one-third of the business houses in this city could meet their obligations to-day if suddenly called on to do so. Care and anxiety is the rule, and the dread of bankruptcy has for thousands of seemingly prosperous men all the terror that the dread of starvation has for the very poor. Is it any wonder that we read of suicides among those living in wealth? Is it any wonder that, where it is possible, those engaged in one line of business seek security from the fluctuations of the market by forming combinations, pools and trusts?

Yet certainty of a steady business would obviate the main cause of this uncertainty and maddening anxiety. Give labor unrestricted access to natural opportunities and there will never be a dearth of raw materials. Give to the workmen thus kept busy the full fruits of their toil and we shall never fail to see a market for all the desirable things that ingenuity can fashion and skilled labor produce. Mistakes of judgment might be made, but they would have to be enormous mistakes in order to work disaster to every one—such mistakes as never yet have been seen, for there never have been more manufactured goods in this country than could easily find a profitable market if the people wanting them had money, and there have never been crops too big to find profitable exchange had trade been free.

Have merchants not more reason than some of them imagine for considering on their own account the remedies for the evils that shut labor out from production and at the same time curtail the purchasing power of the people? Let them ask themselves if they also are not ground between this upper and nether millstone of land monopoly.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE REAL ESTATE BROKER.

The Chicago real estate board recently had its annual banquet, and if the pictures with which the Chicago *Herald* garnishes its report of the proceedings are accurate likenesses, the real estate brokers of that city are a jolly, well fed and prosperous body of men. There were speeches, of course, and some of them were more interesting than the speakers themselves intended.

Ex-Governor Hamilton said that during the early days in Illinois real estate brokers

were known as "land sharks," and he congratulated them on their improved position. Alexander S. Porter, a real estate broker of Boston, said that in the old days a real estate broker was that and nothing more, but that to-day he is a leader in almost every enterprise throughout the country, be it a building syndicate, a railway line or a water company. "He is," said Mr. Porter, "the promoter and director of capital, and has done more than any one else to build up our great cities and towns." Waxing eloquent, he said: "Gentlemen, I believe we have just begun; the play is not half over, and I predict for you an even more brilliant and successful future."

All of this must have been highly gratifying to the prosperous professional gentleman who has within the memory of men still living been evolved from the despised "land shark." The latter was the man who ran ahead of the pioneers in the early days of settlement and grabbed the choice places in order that he might make the less nimble settler pay for the privilege of using them. Things have changed since then, and the descendants of the emigrants who cursed the land sharks are anxious, as capitalists, to employ the services of the shrewd specialists who can point out to them (for a commission) the opportunities constantly opening to gain over those still coming here, through birth or immigration, just precisely the advantage that the land shark obtained over the original settlers; and so the real estate broker is the promoter of everything that tends to raise the rental value of land in order to give his clients the power to tax every form of that industry which constitutes or creates what we call our wonderful modern progress.

As the real estate broker reaps large profits from this system he naturally continues it, and it is not surprising that in response to a toast declaring that the strength of a republican nation "is in its humble, but well ordered homes" Colonel R. C. Givens should protest against any questioning of the sacredness of the right of private ownership in land. Colonel Givens's statement of what he called the Henry George theory was as remarkable as his history of the experiences of the Pilgrim fathers in the common ownership of land and as truthful as his declaration that in this country ownership of land is almost thrust upon its citizens, and that the ordinary laborer is the owner of a humble but happy home. Such post-prandial eloquence as late an hour ^{minutely} begot courage, and the gallant colonel gave reasons why the progeny of the ancient land shark "cannot permit the Henry George theory to flourish in this country."

Yet somehow it does flourish like a green bay tree, and the speeches at this Chicago banquet are not in our opinion likely to check its growth.

EXIT BLAINE.

James G. Blaine has formally announced in a letter to B. F. Jones, chairman of the republican national committee, that his name will not be presented to the coming republican national convention as a candidate for president. Mr. Blaine says that he is constrained to this decision by reasons purely personal to himself.

He advised Mr. Jones more than a year ago. He predicts an easy victory for the republican party, and bases his hope on the introduction of the tariff issue by Mr. Cleveland's nomination. Strangely enough, Mr. Blaine nowhere in the letter discusses the contingency that his name may be put before the republican convention without his consent, and he fails to say that, if nominated under such circumstances, he would not accept the nomination. Yet such a contingency is not really possible, but probable.

Owing to this omission some other newspapers hostile to Mr. Blaine treat his letter as a bid for the nomination, a less enthusiastic admirer, the *Tribune*, of the letter as one in which Mr. Blaine "withdraws his name so far as it is his power to do so." Thus friend and foe bear in mind that the withdrawal in February will prevent the nomination from nominating Mr. Blaine.

The probability is that the withdrawal will prove effective. There have been many symptoms of republican impatience with the clamor for Blaine's nomination. John Sherman and others are actively seeking the republican nomination, and whatever other effect Mr. Blaine's letter may have it will, at least, offer to any of his former supporters the opportunity to join their fortunes with those of some other candidate. The effect of this may readily be so great that a attempt by Mr. Blaine to reconsider his determination may prove futile.

The disappearance of Mr. Blaine from the political field will be a distinct gain to the political party. His nomination would at once thrust questions of personal character into the canvas. His possible flighty and erratic forebodings, and he declared that he emphatically policy would likewise be made an issue.

If the republicans want to try the new rapid transit lines should be owned by the protective idea they should. By the city. While mayor of Brooklyn, aside everything that promises to comp-

anyone to do with the city, he had daily occasion to re-ate the situation and nominate a man unblemished reputation on a high tariff platform. Again, Mr. Blaine's retirement opens up to a more creditable and hopeful course. If the present lagar, influence belonging to the old parties are congress fails to do anything effective toward tariff reform, the republicans who are committed to tariff revision and reduction, in their platform, might suddenly remember their broken pledges and come out for tariff reform themselves. The change of front would be no greater than that which they made with perfect ease on the green back question.

Nothing of the kind is likely to happen, however. No dodging or cowardice on the part of the democratic majority in the house of representatives can save their party from responsibility for President Cleveland's message, and the protected monopolies will see to it that the republican party shall still champion their interests. The democrats may as well prepare to face the attack to be made on them as free traders, and the absence of Mr. Blaine from the contest will compel them to defend tariff reduction on principle instead of attacking the personal character of the opposing candidate. Mr. Blaine's act is another in a series of events that prepare the way for a great contest on an economic issue, and nothing so quickly as such a contest can educate the great mass of our people into a readiness for the vastly greater economic question on which they must divide before the march of monopoly shall be ended.

"BREWSTER'S FOLLY."
The property on Broadway, once known as "Brewster's Folly," has recently been sold for \$248,500. There was erected on it a fine marble front five-story building, which stood vacant for thirty-three years. It covered lots 627 and 629 Broadway and extended through to Mercer street, the whole lot being fifty feet in width with a depth of 200 feet. Mr. Brewster was an eccentric old bachelor, who had an idea that it was worth a higher rent than any one would pay for it. He accordingly shut up and held it vacant. The effect was injurious to other property in the block, and the owners of adjacent property stormed and swore, and even talked of bringing suit for damages against Mr. Brewster. They apparently forgot the logic of their own position and seemed to think that, somehow, land ownership does not affect all entitle a man to do what he will with his own. It is now believed that Mr. Brewster's freak has permanently injured the neighborhood, and after his death the executors found difficulty in renting the building even at a reasonable price.

It is said that Mr. Brewster paid his taxes heavily, and took comfort out of the woe of his neighbors. He must have possessed considerable other property to enable him to occupy comfortable bachelor quarters at the New York hotel during the thirty-three years that he indulged his peculiar whim. The papers say that during the time he paid twenty thousand dollars in taxes. He must have paid very much more than that, as the property was assessed in 1883 at \$166,000, and is now assessed at \$174,000. A good many other occupants of land must have been pretty heavily taxed by Mr. Brewster, tenable him to pay the taxes on his "folly."

The property, it will be noted, sold for \$245,500, and is assessed for \$174,000. This is very near to two-thirds of its auction value, which is \$175,666. Any examination of ordinary Broadway property shows that, as a rule, the assessment is just about the selling price of the bare land, and it is entirely safe to assume that the land in this case is worth \$170,000.

Experience shows that plenty of men can be found who will gladly lease bare land at five per cent on its selling value and contract to pay the taxes in addition. This demonstrates that the full rental value of bare land is .0716 on its selling price. Suppose that Mr. Brewster's land had been taxed to its rental value on \$170,000, does any one suppose that he would have been ready to pay for his folly \$12,172 a year? Under such circumstances his only profit on the property would have been from the hire of the building, and he would doubtless have been very glad to obtain a tenant who would pay him a reasonable profit on his investment. Buildings are the product of labor and their cost is easily ascertainable, so that the craziest old bachelor in the land is not likely to over value them. Under the single tax system the tax or ground rent would always be a known quantity, and merchants could erect buildings for themselves or else find plenty of men ready to erect them on the promise of a fair return on the capital thus expended. The cranky Brewsters and the numerous smaller obstructionists who now maintain unsightly buildings on our leading streets would rapidly disappear under such a system and merchants would not find their rents increased, though they would be relieved from all taxes other than those levied on land.

A committee appointed by the New York chamber of commerce attended the meeting of the committee of railroads of the board of aldermen on Friday of last week and informed the aldermen that Mayor Hewitt's message concerning rapid transit had been indorsed by the chamber of commerce. Morris K. Jesup, chairman of the visiting committee, declared that he was in favor of having the city undertake the work. Seth Low, ex-mayor of Brooklyn, was a member of the committee. His possible flighty and erratic forebodings, and he declared that he emphatically policy would likewise be made an issue.

If the republicans want to try the new rapid transit lines should be owned by the protective idea they should. By the city. While mayor of Brooklyn, aside everything that promises to comp-

anyone to do with the city, he had daily occasion to re-ate the situation and nominate a man unblemished reputation on a high tariff platform. Again, Mr. Blaine's retirement opens up to a more creditable and hopeful course. If the present lagar, influence belonging to the old parties are congress fails to do anything effective toward tariff reform, the republicans who are committed to tariff revision and reduction, in their platform, might suddenly remember their broken pledges and come out for tariff reform themselves. The change of front would be no greater than that which they made with perfect ease on the green back question.

five months, makes it impossible. One or two

have informed me that they have renewed, but the rest are unable to do so. I purchase as many copies every week as I can and send them where I think they will do the most good. In this vicinity *The Standard* has indeed done a noble work. The good seed which it sows is bearing fruit. Men are thinking to-day who never thought before, and the "cranky" notion of "abolishing all taxation save a single one upon land values" now finds defenders wherever it is attacked. The present strike, while deplorable because of the immense damage it is doing to business and the untold suffering which it inflicts upon innocent men, women and children, nevertheless without an encouraging aspect. The fact that the operators have refused the just demands of the most oppressed, but best organized, body of coal miners in this country, and have for five months successfully resisted the men without apparently much loss to themselves, while the miners have been compelled to depend upon their toiling brethren, has opened the eyes of many, and they are asking themselves how it is that, although thirty years ago the operators and their employees were equally poor, to-day the employers have scores of millions while the miners who risked life and limb in order to bring this great wealth from the bowels of the earth, and who have undoubtedly been oppressed beyond all endurance, find themselves so poor that they could not have stood this strike for two weeks save for the charity of others! Aided by *The Standard* and the tracts which we have been distributing, they are beginning to "see the cat." They have discovered this vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of the operators to be due, not to their superior intelligence and business tact, but to the stupidity of the masses in permitting them to monopolize natural opportunities and acquire franchises contrary to the spirit of our institutions. Whether the miners receive the advances they have demanded or are compelled to return to work at the old rates, this strike will be a success, because it has awakened thought and aroused discussion which will not cease until the true solution of the industrial problem is found, which is, the securing to all men of their equal rights to natural opportunities provided for by their Creator.

W. B. ESTELL.

A Plan for a Single State Campaign.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.—The aim of the anti-poverty society and of the united labor party is to get their views thoroughly understood by a majority of the thinking, reasoning people of the United States. And as Mr. George clearly shows, the tariff issue now coming into discussion between the two old parties may be made the means of bringing the principles of the Syracuse platform before the country, without injury to the infant organization of the united labor party. It seems to me it would be well for all earnest workers to take advantage of the situation.

The anti-poverty society has got on its seven property boots, and is making tremendous strides, not only in this country, but all over the world. During the coming campaign on the tariff issue, the advocacy of its principles will strengthen the wavering ones who are in a fair way of soon seeing the cat, and will start a hundred thousand men on a pilgrimage to the

It seems to me as though the political machines that have heretofore plowed and harrowed and sowed the seeds of political disaster in our country, at last propose to mix a trifle of wheat with the other seeds; and the united labor party will do well to go over the ground with the seed sowers and see to it that at least an even quantity of wheat is put in. In this way our principles will gain a firm footing all over the country, and when the next presidential campaign comes round we shall have no groping in the dark, no fear of casting away our votes, but can present our ballots at the polls with as much certainty as we would a \$1,000 certified check at the United States treasury.

In the meantime we can, if we wish, mass our forces on whatever state will enable us to put the single land tax into operation with the least expenditure of time and money. In my native state, Rhode Island, there are 15,000 to 16,000 voters, who could be supplied with *The Standard* for one year, for say \$30,000. A sufficient fund would be needed to keep our best speakers steadily at work in the state. And the flame of agitation once lighted would sweep over the whole state and enable us to capture it within a year.

J. NORMANDY.

Virginia Considering the Australian System.

RICHMOND, Va.—A bill has been introduced into our legislature which is an attempt at adjusting the election laws of Australia to elections in Virginia. The passage of such a law would be gratifying to those workingmen whose bread depends on their voting as their employers dictate. Immediately after the recent election in this state several employers discharged those of their employees who had voted the "reform" ticket. Although not a "reformer" in the sense in which it was used at that election, I am most

mighty opposed to the political or religious rights of any one being abridged by those who deem themselves the especial favorites of divinity.

I could not get a *STANDARD* in town last Saturday. The newsdealer said there had been a great demand for them. Heretofore I have been able to get them, and those which I have had have been worse so thin by borrowers that they are not able to hold themselves together, and those who borrow them do not fail to "see the cat" and make

the most earnest advocates of true democracy and absolute individuality. After all, it is not, as remarked by a most eminent gentleman, "only a question of intellectual ability."

CHARLES LEIDY.

Has to Work for a Living and So Dare Not Sigh His Name.

OLYMPIA, Washington Territory.—I first heard of *The Standard* about a year ago, when there was but a single copy to be found in the town. As yet we have no formal organization, but a few of us meet on Sunday afternoon to talk and read and argue with one another, and we try our best to get people to discuss the question. Monopoly is well illustrated here by the concentration of our magnificent timber lands in the hands of the large mill corporations

THE NEW YORK POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES.

How Many Hours a Day Does a Carrier Work?—The Effect of Inquisitorial Discipline Upon the Force.

Whatever may be thought in New York of public servants generally, the letter carriers as a body, possess the hearty good will of the mass of the citizens. The fact that a man holds the position of letter carrier is commonly accepted as evidence that he is day by day punctually and unfailingly performing a tedious and often vexatious task. It is also considered that the duties of a carrier require intelligent labor. He must be sober and industrious. He must possess qualifications much above those of the man who can command only the wages of common labor. His place is one of trust. It might be thought, therefore, that his lot would be as comfortable as he might reasonably hope for, especially as he is in the employ of the general government, which is, as a rule, made to pay liberally for its service, and the esteem and good will of the public might be expected to help to make his berth as easy one.

But Uncle Sam's munificence has not been invoked to the extent of compensating the letter carriers of New York to a point above what they might earn in private employment for the same amount of work, and the inert great public has exerted very little influence in assisting them to remedy positive grievances under which they have long suffered. Their case has been up for general discussion for some years. Congress has had some debate over it, a commission glanced at it once for a brief while, sympathetic citizens turned out to mass meetings held for the purpose of presenting it to the public, the newspapers and the post office authorities, and the methods of organized labor were employed to compel a hearing of it at quarters whence relief was quite confidently expected. Nevertheless, the letter carrier to-day follows his accustomed wearisome routine the same as ever, and his burden of cares have not been lightened by a particle.

It might be supposed that, with some little test of the endurance of his legs and of his ability to read superscriptions, the trials of the letter carrier would be at an end. There is, it is true, little to learn in the simple act of carrying the mail. The carrier is on hand at the office at 6 o'clock. He at once proceeds to "set up his route," as he terms the work of arranging in separate packages the city letters, out-of-town mail letters, postal cards and newspapers. Then he counts the pieces of each class and arranges them in the order of the houses on his route of delivery. A route is served by two carriers. At half-past 7 they start on their first trip. Thence forward, during the day the two "partners" set out alternately on a number of delivery trips, the beginning of each being timed by a schedule. This is what the public sees of the carrier's work, and little heed is given as to what else falls in the line of his duty. What he is seen to do seems easy enough, and perhaps not too much for his well-being. But the carrier can explain that he does more than simply carry mail.

The post office superintendents officially regard the actual performance of carrying the mail as the carrier's only work, and they keep at each station a time book in which is entered a record of the number of hours a day each carrier is engaged in delivering mail. It is really, however, according to this method of reckoning, when the carrier is not at work that his troubles are deepest, namely when he is "setting up" his route, searching the directory for the possible destination of letters bearing "blind" addresses, looking over the station "log" for records of letters probably belonging to residents of his route, and "logging" letters misdirected or from any other cause undeliverable on his route.

The curious distinction of the post office officials between what is work and what is not work in the daily duties of a carrier led the New York postmaster into contradictory official statements a few years ago. The fact was pointed out on the floor of the house of representatives by Congressman Crain in a debate on the eight-hour bill in July, 1886. The New York postmaster had reported on one occasion that the average day's work of the carriers of this city was but eight hours and thirty minutes in length. When, however, on another occasion he was asked to state what would be the effect of the eight-hour law in New York, he said it would require him to ask for an additional force of 500 carriers. Mr. Crain said it was a fact that the 700 carriers then employed worked only eight hours and a half, the new law would necessitate an increase of but forty-five men. The truth was that facts were being manufactured to suit. By allowing to the carriers "time" in the books only for time consumed in delivering mail, the average day was made to appear short, but it suddenly stretched to its full length when the postmaster's record for economy was likely to be endangered through a compulsory employment of a large force. In speaking of the time book farce, a carrier said lately that he expected soon to see entries made regularly of the time, in the opinion of the superintendent, the carrier ought to finish his delivery instead of the actual time taken.

The carriers are held to strict account for the extra, unpaid, unbooked work which they perform. The "Official Post Office Circular," which is issued weekly, but "not for public circulation or display," contains a list of "offenses and penalties," in which are given the names and positions of the post office employees of the city found derelict in their duty during the week previous with the punishment imposed in each case in consequence. Neglect to promptly "log" undeliverable mail, and neglect to study the station "log" so as to be able to guess that among the misdirected letters some are meant for people on his route, are punishable by the suspension or fine of the carrier. Failure to ascertain from the directory the correct address of a "blindly" addressed letter, and failure to interpret a notice of removal in the record book, are also crimes in the superintendent's calendar. The official list of misdemeanants is on an average about twenty a week. The fine imposed on clerks is usually \$2, and the term of suspension on carriers a day or two, yet the offense recorded is not infrequently what to the outsider seems to be simply an oversight incidental to work that is often necessarily done in great haste. References are made in the official circular to violation of "Order No. 1,700," or "Order No. 1,560," which suggests that a multiplicity of orders may have something to do with the haggard appearance of the average letter carrier. The weight of the "log" on his shoulders may be imagined from the fact that from 10,000 to 14,000 letters are "logged" on some routes in a year. In addition, 400 removal notices a year is not unusual, with "publishers' removal notices" heaped on top of the load.

There is at least one carrier on the New York force who has a methodical and statistical mind united with a determination to put these traits to good use should a congressional commission ever invite him to come forward to testify before it, promising him at the same time protection from the resultant spitework of the superintendents. He has kept a record to the accuracy of which he is prepared to make affidavit, of

the number of hours a day that he worked during a period extending over several months, with sundry notes of his observations of things going on in the post office from day to day during that time. For the eighty days beginning Nov. 27, 1886, and ending Feb. 22, 1887, he worked on an average twelve hours and twenty-seven minutes a day. The average was brought down somewhat by the four holidays—Thanksgiving day, Christmas, New Year's and Washington's Birthday—which came along in that time. In Christmas week he was seventy-five hours on duty; in New Year's week seventy-six hours and forty-five minutes. In one other week he worked eighty-nine hours and twenty-five minutes. The lowest week was seventy hours. There were weeks in which he never saw his children awake from Monday morning until the next Sunday.

The mail collector, the man who bends almost double under an immense sackful of mail as he makes his way to the post office, and who is on down-town routes called a "jackass" by the small boys, has it, on the whole, somewhat easier than the carrier. His mental burdens are less. "Logs" and "removal notices" do not haunt him in his sleep like nightmares. The envied up-town collector has simply the pleasant task of trotting from eighteen to twenty-two miles a day, stopping at all the street mail boxes on his way and gathering in their contents. He must not deviate from the route laid down for him, or skip a single box, lest he be suspended. When he takes up with his occupation, his weight being usually 140 to 160 pounds, he has before him the enjoyable prospect of training down to bone and muscle only—when he will weigh most likely 110 to 125 pounds. In winter, unimpeded by a long, heavy overcoat, the wearing of which would be contrary to regulations, he has the opportunity to keep warm by much congenial exercise. Sometimes he goes three miles at a rapid pace in the face of a cutting, icy wind, while people generally are hugging the stoves. Then it is that he reflects that all these remedies are merely palliative, and not preventive.

The substitute letter carrier, who works long hours for what he may chance to earn while carrying special delivery letters and working for regular carriers, earning about as much as a porter in a store on short hours, is constantly on his trial for good behavior before a superintendent, who may favor him or not. In consequence, he is not over independent. When he is sent down to the general post office for stamps and gets no pay for it, and finds on his return that several special delivery letters which should have brought him eight cents apiece, have been, contrary to regulations, sent out by regular carriers, he does not give voice to all his sentiments. He tries to considerately remember that the city postmaster gets credit in his surplus for the special delivery money saved from the substitutes. The substitute endeavors to qualify himself for a regular position by frequently working from 4 a.m. to 12 p.m., and conforms himself by reflecting that the clerks sometimes go on duty at 8 o'clock, one morning and remain at their post until 7 the next.

During the past year much energy has been expended by the lesser authorities of the New York post office in breaking the spirit of such employes as were suspected of being members of a labor organization. The tactics pursued was the selection of such men as were past the vigor of their youth, and had large families dependent upon them, and applying the official screws to them until the poor victims reluctantly confessed what they knew or had heard of what was going on among their fellow employes in connection with organized labor. As a result, at one time list of twenty-eight names was exhibited to his force by a station superintendent as those of "suspects," and all were required, on pain of disreputable consequences in case of refusal, to sign a declaration that they thereby severed all connection with the pro-organized organization. At another station sixteen men were disciplined in the same manner. After such manner have happier conditions been established by the superintendents. Peace reigns and all the employes are placidly, automatically performing their work. They read without a thought of criticism of the abrupt rejection of the petition of the committee representing the clerks of fifty-three free delivery cities to the postmaster of New York, that he permit them to invite the co-operation of the clerks in his jurisdiction in asking congress to give postal clerks better terms. They read, also, that the postmaster general has rebuked the autocratic New York postmaster. They have bowed their heads to the yoke—they are model, loyal workmen.

A ray of hope, however, occasionally comes to the post office employe from the direction of Washington. Congressmen Cox, Merriam and McAdoo have introduced at the present session a bill to increase their salaries, shorten their hours, and allow them vacations. A petition signed by several thousand New York business men may have some effect toward producing its passage. The new postmaster general has actually recognized the right of the clerks to petition congress for legislation in their behalf. A better day may be dawning for the post-office employes. But the fact remains that in America wages are so low generally that men of intelligence and character can be found by the thousands anxious to hold the positions now filled by the post office servs.

Talk About the Message Lends to Talk About Genuine Free Trade.

MONTREAL, Canada.—I am glad to be able to say that the single tax is making good progress here. There is no longer any difficulty in finding men to discuss its merits with.

I took a trip through Vermont a few weeks ago, and was much surprised to find what progress our cause has made in that conservative old state. Conversations which I listened to and took part in on the subject of President Cleveland's late message all seemed somehow to end with: "Well, what about Henry George's free trade?" And then there was sure to be a discussion, in which the grand central idea of the single tax always found a champion.

You are right in discouraging the running of a candidate by the united labor party at the next presidential election. It will not do to waste any shots. I am satisfied the democrats are doing our work for us, perhaps better than we can do it ourselves.

With such a band of noble men and women as are engaged in the new crusade, leading the van of thought, why should we waste time and money to get votes? Would it not be best to take the money required to run an election and place at least six STANDARDS in every town in every state in the Union?

I enclose \$2 for some tracts to distribute among railroad men, farmers, clerks and others.

L. L. PELTIER.

Believe in Capturing a Single State.

I heartily agree with those who believe in concentrating our forces on one state. And the state of New York should be the first attacked, because our friends in that state have had two years' experience and have become experienced workmen, while in other states they are only apprentices.

L. PHILLIPS.

THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENTS.

A Physician Points Out How Our Present Social System Denies the Right to Life-Land Monopoly as a Parent of Disease.

BALTIMORE, Maryland.—It may be of interest to the readers of THE STANDARD to observe the effects that may be expected to follow the single tax reform from the standpoint of a medical practitioner.

That a large number of infants die annually in every city, especially during the summer months, is a fact that everybody knows. They die simply for the want of the proper amount of oxygen needed to keep them alive. They are excluded from this gift of nature by the present laws governing society. To explain this idea more clearly it is necessary that I should relate my personal experience of conversion to the George idea, which happened about five years ago.

During the summer months I was frequently called to see children suffering from that peculiar disease known as cholera infantum. It is principally characterized by peculiar and profound depression of the nervous system. Its symptoms are somewhat analogous to what we should find in partial suffocation, and from the same cause—the absence of oxygen in the air. Drugs as remedies in this disease are of little avail. The only possible hope of saving the little one's life lies in getting it a supply of air. So we send it to the country or on excursions. The charitably disposed have established "fresh air fund" free excursions, and a philanthropic gentleman of our city has endowed a noble sanitarium, where mothers and children are fed and lodged in the country free of all charge. But notwithstanding all these make-shift remedies, the annual massacre of the innocents continues. And it will always continue until we get the single tax on land values, for this reason, that all these remedies are merely palliative, and not preventive.

So long as the causes of infant mortality

are not abolished we cannot pretend to

secure to the people those rights to "life,

liberty and the pursuit of happiness" which we pretentiously announce to the world as "unalienable."

The little ones of course have never bartered away these rights, but their fathers have had and for not even a "ness of

patience."

In Baltimore, as in every other large city,

we find crowded centers alternated with

large areas of vacant land. If you wish to

save your families' lives you add sanitary ar-

rangements to your house, bringing more

light, air and water to the various rooms.

Then along comes the tax gatherer and fines

you by an increase of taxes.

The vacant lands of our cities are surces

of disease. Many localities that a genera-

tion ago were sources of malaria have been

rendered healthy by the improvements. Slag

from a furnace dumped in a marsh will do

more for the permanent removal of malaria

than all the quinine of a drug shop. Communi-

cation in many cases might be prevented, and

the hereditary tendency would probably be

extinct, possibly in one generation. The

same is true of diphtheria, scarlet fever and

the other zymotic diseases.

The medical science of the future will aim

to fight disease by preventing it. Physicians

are being compelled to study the remote

causes of disease; and I have no doubt they

will place first on the list of these the

private ownership of land. And in this way

they will form a body of missionaries fit to

be despised. Their training makes them to

see the evils around them, and renders them

willing to accept anything within the

bounds of reason in the way of remedy. I

flatter myself that more progress is to be ex-

pected through their agency than through

that of either the clerical or legal profes-

sions when once the single tax is fairly pre-

sent to them. Their associations are closer to

the people from the "cradle to the grave" than

either clergymen's or lawyers', and they

have the trials of the masses better.

The medical science of the future will aim

to fight disease by preventing it. Physicians

are being compelled to study the remote

causes of disease; and I have no doubt they

will place first on the list of these the

private ownership of land. And in this way

they will form a body of missionaries fit to

be despised. Their training makes them to

see the evils around them, and renders them

willing to accept anything within the

bounds of reason in the way of remedy. I

flatter myself that more progress is to be ex-

pected through their agency than through

that of either the clerical or legal profes-

sions when once the single tax is fairly pre-

sent to them. Their associations are closer to

the people from the "cradle to the grave" than

either clergymen's or lawyers', and they

have the trials of the masses better.

The medical science of the future will aim

to fight disease by preventing it. Physicians

are being compelled to study the remote

causes of disease; and I have no doubt they

will place first on the list of these the

private ownership of land. And in this way

they will form a body of missionaries fit to

be despised. Their training makes them to

see the evils around them, and renders them

willing to accept anything within the

bounds of reason in the way of remedy. I

flatter myself that more progress is to be ex-

pected through their agency than through

that of either the clerical or legal profes-

sions

TRINITY'S HIDDEN MILLIONS.

Some months ago, while looking over some maps and records in one of the public offices of this city, I asked one of the clerks if he could show me a map of the property owned by Trinity church. He laughingly replied: "I would be much obliged if you would show me such a map."

"Is it not necessary that the men in this office should now and then see such a map?" I asked.

"Yes," he replied, "but we are only allowed to see precisely so much of the map as is necessary, and no man can get a look at a map showing the whole of Trinity's property."

This struck me at the time as a remarkable exhibition of the reticence and caution that marks the conduct of all custodians or trustees holding large bodies of real estate in this city, and I was determined, as opportunity offered, to give more attention to the estate of this great religious corporation, which, by virtue of certain grants made long ago by kings and queens of a people from whom we have been politically separated for more than a century, still exercises a right to levy an enormous tax on people for the privilege of living or transacting business on certain portions of Manhattan island.

The work is one that might easily occupy a man's whole time for many years; but in a literary junk shop I recently ran across a large number of pamphlets that show that Trinity's policy of concealment is not of recent origin, and that not only has this corporation refused information to public officers in this city, but more than thirty years ago it defied the power of the state of New York to exercise any power over it or even to examine into its affairs.

For some years prior to 1856 there was much excitement in Episcopal circles in this city over the alleged favoritism of Trinity in granting assistance to congregations belonging to the Protestant Episcopal church. The standing committee of Trinity was strongly imbued with what are known as high church ideas, and the low church people, under the lead of Rev. Thomas House Taylor, rector of Grace church, strongly remonstrated against the policy of Trinity in granting liberal aid to high churches, however rich, and refusing any aid whatever to low churches, however great their necessities. Fuel was added to the flame by the positive refusal of Trinity to save a free low church from sheriff's sale for a debt of only \$1,500. It was further alleged by the complainants that Trinity took mortgages for all of its advances to struggling churches, and that through these mortgages it exercised undue control over aided churches, and practically forced them to vote with it on all questions arising in the diocesan conventions. It is entirely unnecessary to my present purpose to go further into this dispute than to remark that the evidence was such as to convince the investigating committee appointed by the state senate that the charge was well founded.

In the course of the controversy the opponents of the then existing management in Trinity became convinced that Trinity church and its vast estate belonged to all of the people in the city of New York who were members of the Protestant Episcopal church. They found that Trinity's title to all the property held by it rested upon the original charter granted in 1697, which merely included the church and church yard and the grant of the king's farm made by Queen Anne in 1705. The original charter in set terms conveyed the property for "the use and behalf of the inhabitants from time to time inhabiting and to inhabit within our said city of New York, in communion with our said Protestant church of England," the title of the corporation being "the rector and inhabitants of the city of New York in communion with the church of England," and the charter provided that two church wardens and twenty vestrymen should be elected annually by the majority of the votes of such inhabitants. In 1697 the colonial legislature confirmed this grant in an act couched in the identical language of the grant so far as rector and inhabitants were concerned. Queen Anne in 1705 gave the king's farm to the rector and inhabitants thus constituted a corporation, and no further legislation affecting the matter was had until after the revolution. In 1784 a law was passed by the New York legislature ratifying the old charter and grant which substantially made no change except to substitute the words "Episcopal church" for "church of England," but which still included in the corporation inhabitants of the city and county of New York in communion with the Episcopal church.

There was no further legislation until 1814, when an act was passed changing the title of the corporation to "the rector, church wardens and vestrymen of Trinity church in the city of New York," and confining the right to vote for wardens and vestrymen to male persons of full age who, for the space of one year preceding the election had been members of the congregation of Trinity or any of its chapels. The opponents of the existing management of Trinity in 1855 insisted that this act of 1814 was a direct violation of the rights originally granted to all the inhabitants of New York city who were communicants or members of the Episcopal church, and they petitioned the legislature for the repeal of that law and the restoration of the right to vote for church wardens and vestrymen of Trinity to all of the Episcopalians residing in New York and qualified to vote in other Episcopal churches. The petition was accompanied by charges against the administration of Trinity's estate and a request for an investigation. The request was granted and, as a result, one of the most interesting and exciting controversies that ever occupied the attention of the legislature took place at the session of 1856-57.

Trinity appeared by counsel and fought the investigation step by step. It denied the jurisdiction of the legislature, denounced its action as an interference with

vested rights, and brought the most powerful influences to bear for the defeat of the proposed bill granting the demands of the petitioners. Rev. William Berrian, D.D., then rector, wrote a pamphlet in defense of Trinity. John A. Dix, afterward governor of the state, appeared as a vestryman to oppose the pending bill, and Erastus Brooks, then in the state senate, championed the cause of the corporation on the floor of that body. The record of the speeches and debates and the printed testimony of witnesses is even yet interesting and lively reading, and it is not without importance as demonstrating how firmly rooted the policy of concealment was, even thirty years ago, and how little restraint religion exercised over the agents of a religious corporation in their efforts to conceal from a prying public the extent of its possessions and the sources and disposition of its income. Contempt of a legislative committee's authority does not appear to have then been a punishable offense, and refusal to appear before the committee or to answer inconvenient questions without appearing were numerous. The only thing that appears to have induced the Trinity people to appear before the committee at all was the apparent determination of the committee to close the case with the testimony of their opponents and to base a bill on the testimony.

When resistance to the legislature appeared to be futile, the managers began to cover up the facts by falsehood. Trinity church had been required by a resolution of the senate to set forth the value of her real estate. The answer was about \$1,500,000. An examination made by the committee showed that the property was worth fully \$10,000,000, and one of the men asked to value it by the committee declared his willingness to pay \$7,000,000 cash for it. When the representatives of the corporation were taxed with their deception in this matter, they replied that they had taken the valuation of the assessors, yet every one knew then, as well as all know now, that the valuation of the assessors is not even intended to represent the true value of real estate. The condition of many of these is such that, so far as the comforts of life are concerned, and freedom from the care of the thought of providing for their loved ones, the inmates in these institutions are better off than they. The wages of these are so small that they are scarcely able to make enough to procure the simplest food and pay rent for an uncomfortable room, by toiling every moment from early in the morning until 10 or 12 o'clock at night, and sometimes until 1 or 2 in the morning. Some even feel obliged to work as dili-

gently on Sundays as on week days.—(Cincinnati Christian Advocate.)

In 1855 the senate of this state proposed certain questions to the corporation of Trinity church, and to these questions no answer was made. A committee of investigation was next appointed, which, prior to the opening of the session of 1856-57, met in New York city, and served notice on the officers of the corporation to appear before them. No official response was made by Trinity, and one of the vestrymen refused to answer questions put to him on the ground that the whole matter was a controversy between the corporation and the committee, and that it would be improper for him to answer questions put to him by the latter. Other witnesses came forward freely, however, and the testimony taken by the committee was damaging to the corporation. Senator Noxon, of the investigating committee, in the course of a speech in the senate delivered March 25, 1857, said:

The senate knows and I know the difficulties this legislature has experienced in investigating this matter. The first thing we did when the abuses of the corporation were brought to our notice was simply to press for wardens and vestrymen, and that they had been improperly and unconstitutionally deprived of this right by the law passed in 1814. The committee reported a bill returning to all Episcopalians in the city the right to vote in the choice of the Trinity wardens and vestrymen, and requiring the vestry to furnish annually to all voters a printed statement of the income and expenditure of the corporation.

Senator Brooks introduced a substitute of the kind then called conservative, which instead of deciding in favor of one or the other of two conflicting and irreconcileable claims, proposed to allow the existing corporators to elect one-half of the wardens and vestrymen and to allow the remaining Episcopalians in the city to elect the other half. This bill was passed by the senate on April 6, 1857, and late in the session sent to the house, which failed to take it up.

The fact that the house succumbed to the powerful influences massed at Albany for the defeat of the bill in no way answers the testimony brought out in the senate's investigation, so it appears that the insolent corporation that to-day conceals its property from public officers, thirty years ago defied the state and resorted to falsehood and trickery in order to conceal the truth. The necessity for examining into its affairs is as great to-day as ever it was, and a legislature that attempted such an investigation would doubtless compel witnesses to answer.

W. T. CROASDALE.

W. T. CROASDALE.

No Taxes and a Pension for Everybody.

London Democrat.

"No Taxes and a Pension for Everybody." sounds like a fairy tale. It may be converted into sober fact, not by confiscating property, but by putting a stop to it.

Why should it seem a thing incredible that 100,000 persons, having worked hard and honestly, should at the age of sixty-five receive a pension of £10 per annum to make the remainder of their lives more in accordance with the bountiful provision which nature and art have provided for mankind?

We now give to one landlord what might with justice be distributed to one hundred thousand families. The income of the duke of Westminster is reported to equal one million sterling per annum, and probably this is an under estimate of what he actually receives, and far below what he will get in a few years, unless common sense and common justice are allowed in the meantime to prevail.

For this million sterling per annum the duke confers no advantage whatever upon the community. All the labor by which he profits has been performed or paid for by others.

Through the operation of unjust laws, made by landlords for landlords, he obtains the power to make these exactations.

Year after year adds to his rent roll, while he stands with folded arms and simply absorbs the value for which thousands toil and remain unrewarded.

This gigantic and heartless fraud has called law and religion to its aid. While it defies the ten commandments it invokes them in the pulpit and in the press.

While it tramples on all just laws, human or divine, it bribes lawyers to contend for its unjust privileges and crushes all opposition by the weight of its untold and ill-gotten wealth.

Think for a moment of this fact—every one of the twenty millions of shillings which the duke pockets every year without exercising a single useful function, every one of these shillings shall be earned by the labor of some one who remains unpaid for his labor.

Workingmen in London earning 12s. per week pay 4s. in rent, and of this sum 2s. goes to the ground landlords for doing nothing.

Fancy the duke of Westminster demanding from 2s. per week, or 25 4s. per annum, from working families whose whole income for far less than the price of food alone families are taken to the workhouse in order to postpone actual starvation.

This is thought to be right, reasonable, and just.

Whereas, to propose that a man who has been all his life long defrauded in his wages by means of land-lordism, should have £10 per annum after he is sixty-five is absurd, utopian and, indeed, positively mischievous.

THE SINGLE TAX.

Special editions of ready-printed newspapers contain current Single Tax reading matter. All sizes and prices. UNION PRINTING CO., 15 Vandewater street, New York.

STRAWS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

The New York Sun now joins Mayor Hewitt in advocating a single tax on real estate in lieu of all other direct taxes. Mr. George is to be getting in his work since the late Waterloo at the polls.—[Boston *Times*.]

"What is to be done with the unemployed?" asks the *Graphic*. "Haven't they the tariff?" replies the *Toronto Globe*. They have, but then perhaps their taxes are not high enough. The theory of the men who believe in tariffs as agencies of prosperity is that the more a man is taxed the better off he is.—[Montreal, *Times*.]

Henry George's paper, *THE STANDARD*, has entered its second volume and Mr. George says it has succeeded far beyond anything he had calculated upon. Considering its mission, which some ignorant hoodlums affect to despise so much, the paper certainly has found a field among a class of advanced thinkers which is growing very rapidly. It is now circulating 26,000 copies. What do croakers think of the work?—[Western Watchman, Eureka, Cal.]

Labor invention is designed to benefit labor, but so far it has not benefited it a particle, because these inventions can only be used upon the earth, and the earth owners have been able to dictate the terms upon which they can be used, thus reaping all the benefit. To make work by discouraging invention would be as wasteful as to set fire to our cities to make work. The true remedy is to grant equal rights to the earth.—[Cresco, N. H., *Times*.]

The landlord and tenant system now in vogue in many parts of the coal regions of Pennsylvania is worse than that employed in Ireland. Many of the coal miners in this state are so completely at the mercy of their employers that when they refuse to work at the wages offered to them they are unable to get food because the employer controls the only store near the mine; and if the workingmen can contrive to live in spite of this stoppage of their food supplies, they are then evicted from the company houses occupied by them as dwellings.—[Philadelphia Record.]

The landlord and tenant system now in vogue in many parts of the coal regions of Pennsylvania is worse than that employed in Ireland. Many of the coal miners in this state are so completely at the mercy of their employers that when they refuse to work at the wages offered to them they are unable to get food because the employer controls the only store near the mine; and if the workingmen can contrive to live in spite of this stoppage of their food supplies, they are then evicted from the company houses occupied by them as dwellings.—[Philadelphia Record.]

The following have already appeared:

No. 1. "First Principles." By Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 2. "Land and Taxation." A conversation between David Dudley Field and Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 3. "The Right to the Use of the Earth." By Herbert Spencer. 4 pages.

No. 4. "A Christian Minister on the Remedy for Poverty." By Rev. Hugh O. Peacock of Newark, N. J. 2 pages.

No. 5. "A Sum in Propportion." By T. L. McCready. 2 pages.

No. 6. "The Settler's Nightmare." By Louis F. Post. 4 pages.

No. 7. "New York's Docks: The True Mode of Raising Revenue." By J. W. Sullivan. 4 pages.

No. 8. "Unemployed Labor." By Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 9. "Voices for Reform." 2 pages.

No. 10. "Mysterious Disappearance." By Lewis Freedman. 5 pages.

No. 11. "How to Increase Profits." By A. J. Stearn. 2 pages.

No. 12. "The American Farmer." By Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 13. "Sailors' Sing Harbor and the Randall Farm." By W. T. Croasdale. 12 pages.

No. 14. "The Collegiate Church and the Shoemakers' Field." By W. T. Croasdale. 12 pages.

No. 15. "Only a Dream." By Abner C. Thomas. 4 pages.

No. 16. "The Anti-Poverty Society." Dr. McGlynn's address at the first meeting. 8 pages.

No. 17. "The Cross of the New Crusade." A poem. By David Rorty. 2 pages.

No. 18. "It is the Law of Christ." By Rev. Dr. S. M. St. John. 8 pages.

No. 19. "My Landlord." By John Jones. 4 pages.

No. 20. "Thou Shall Not Steal." An address by Henry George before the Anti-Poverty Society. 8 pages.

No. 21. "Christianity and Poverty." An address by Rev. Dr. Huntington before the Anti-poverty society. 4 pages.

No. 22. "Poverty and Christianity." An address by Rev. Hugh O. Peacock before the Anti-poverty society. 4 pages.

No. 23. "Injustice of Private Property in Land." Enslavement of laborers the ultimate result of private property. 4 pages.

No. 24. "Claims of Laborers to Compensation." 4 pages.

No. 25. "Property in Land historically considered." 5 pages.

No. 26. "Property in Land in the United States." 4 pages.

Book VIII.—APPLICATION OF THE REMEDY.

Chap. 1. The present condition of the poor in the United States.

2. The effect of the remedy upon the distribution of wealth.

3. The effect upon the arts upon the distribution of wealth.

4. The effect of the expectation raised by material progress.

Book IX.—THE PROBLEM SOLVED.

Chap. 1. The primary cause of recurring paroxysms of industrial depression.

2. The persistence of poverty amid advancing wealth.

Book VI.—THE REMEDY.

Chap. 1. Insufficiency of remedies currently advocated.

2. The true remedy.

Book VII.—JUSTICE OF THE REMEDY.

Chap. 1. Injustice of private property in land.

2. Enslavement of laborers the ultimate result of private property.

3. Claims of laborers to compensation.

4. Property in land historically considered.

5. Property in land in the United States.

Book X.—THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS.

Chap. 1. The current theory of human progress—its insufficiency.

2. Differences in civilization—to what due.

3. The law of human progress.

4. How modern civilization may decline.

5. The law of human progress.

Conclusion.

THE PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUAL LIFE.

The new land and labor library paper edition of "Progress and Poverty" is now ready, price thirty-five cents. This is printed on better paper, in larger type, is better bound and a considerably larger book than the previous twenty cent edition.

HENRY GEORGE'S WORKS.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

An Inquiry Into the Cause of Industrial Depression and of Increase of Want With Increase of Wealth—The

THE TARIFF AND THE SUGAR TRUST.

In 1886 we imported raw sugar valued at \$71,236,007, on which there was paid by the refiners a tax of \$50,232,540, an average, of 70 per cent. The table sugar imported paid an average duty of 87 per cent. The refiner was protected by 17 per cent on his products. The gulf planter was protected by 70.

Germany protects its refiners by an average of 13 per cent. It imposed in 1884 a tax of \$5.71 on 220 pounds of raw sugar worth \$9.50, or 60 per cent. On raw sugar that could be used without refining it imposed a duty of \$7.14 per 220 pounds, worth \$10.20, or 70 per cent. On refined, \$7.14 per 220 pounds, worth \$2.70, or 73 per cent.

France does better yet. It admits raw material free of duty and imposes a tariff of \$24 francs on every 220 pounds of refined sugar, worth 63 francs—a duty of 83 per cent. It has built up by this policy, at the expense of its own people only, a gigantic sugar monopoly beside which the proposed American sugar trust is a puny infant.

The American tariff on the raw material has twenty-five different rates ranging from 13 to 24 cents per pound, and averaging 20 cents. The refiner's margin ranges from 3 to 12 cents per pound. In 1880 it ranged from 13 to 3 cents per pound. What does the census of 1880 tell us of their business?

Number of refineries, 49; total workmen, 8,857; wages paid, \$2,573,622; cost of material, \$14,688,494; sold product for \$155,484,915; capital invested, \$7,432,500.

This is all the information that has been made public for seventeen years past concerning this industry, which, through the forty-nine firms, has in that time collected from the African people over \$1,000,000,000 in taxes, about two-thirds being paid into the treasury at Washington and the remainder kept by the forty-nine farmers-general. Not a question has ever been asked them as to the amount collected or how it was collected. The revenues from sugar have been farmed out to them as if each state and territory were an Egyptian pharaoh; for there is exactly one refinery to each state and territory and a little one for the district of Columbia. The eighty-six internal revenue collectors tax the people about \$16,000,000 yearly under the most careful supervision that congress can devise, and must account for every penny. The forty-nine sugar firms tax the people \$70,000,000 yearly, and so long as they pay about \$50,000,000 for the privilege they are at liberty to collect as much more as they please and are accountable to no one and subject to no control.

In 1879 we imported, for refining, raw sugar worth \$67,015,831, and the domestic crop was worth \$8,036,616. The total market value of material was \$75,712,447; the cost of wages, \$2,675,062. The forty-nine refiners reported in May, 1880, that they had sold their products for \$155,484,915, an advance of \$76,897,496. The advance was not gross profits, for the refiners paid into the United States treasury \$39,107,250, and paid in blackmail to the gulf planters \$4,831,354. Let us tabulate its

Imported	\$67,015,831
Domestic	8,036,616
Duty paid United States	\$39,107,250
Tax to planters	\$4,831,354
Cost of material	\$19,611,157
Cost of wages	2,675,062
Total	\$123,856,319
Gross profit	155,484,915
Cost of material	\$2,688,735

This is not accurate. It supposes that the whole product of each year is refined, and that nothing is left over from one year to another. As a rude blocking out, however, let us stand until something better is found.

In 1885 our refineries bought under a burden of 20 per cent and sold at 87. In 1880 they bought under a burden of 58 and sold at 90. They paid an average tax of 24 cents per pound on raw material, and sold at an advance of 24 to 3 cents per pound, an advantage that was reduced one-half by the tariff act of 1883.

Under the old tariff law of 1880 the actual value of their sugar sold that year by them was \$81,000,000; the duty and tax on it was \$16,000,000; total, \$127,000,000. Sold product for \$155,484,915; gross profit to the 49 refiners, \$29,000,000. But as it is hard for the reader to verify the figures of a dead and gone tariff, let us take the present tariff and see what the \$155,484,915 would have represented at the present reduced prices and profits; in other words, what would have been their profit in 1880, provided they had received that amount for the product. We would then have:

Received for product	\$155,484,915
Actual value of sugar	
Imported	\$74,450,393
Domestic	5,696,616
	83,47,811
Tax collected from people	\$6,237,904
Fed U. S. government	\$32,355,776
Gulf planters	6,087,502
Profit	\$14,688,494

This is not only fair and more than fair to the planter and refiner, but it is the lowest assumption that can be made.

The blackmail of \$20,152,627 wrung from the people by the forty-nine refiners includes \$6,057,631 which they hand over to the planters. The \$14,688,494 left with the refiners does not represent net profit, but merely what should have been their extra profit with careful management, over and above the normal profits of business in Cuba or Demerara. It is the premium put upon the refining business in the United States, the bounty or assurance paid the forty-nine firms to make good their losses from experiments, ignorance, waste. From this must be deducted the losses of the foot in business, the careless manager, the speculative trustee, the theoretical experimenter and those unfitted by nature and training who are induced by the broad margin against loss to embark in it. The forty-nine refiners reported in 1880:

Sold product for	\$155,484,915
Cost of material	\$14,688,494
Cost of wages	2,675,062
	157,835,361
Profit	\$7,432,500

Some refineries are bonanzas; others make very little. There is so much wasted in a business like this where each case is presented yearly with fifty per cent of a new capital, and where incompetence is "protected" against loss by a tax on the people, that a sugar trust is a very wise and a very proper thing. If by better management the whole \$14,688,494 can be saved to the forty-nine firms instead of only \$7,432,500, why should it not be done?

If protection is right, the forty-nine firms should be compelled by law to form a sugar trust, making monthly or quarterly reports to the secretary of the treasury, and each refinery should be subjected to government supervision in the same manner as each distillery. A sugar trust does not mean higher taxes and higher rates for sugar, necessarily. It means, first of all, the saving of some portion of \$6,057,631 now lost by waste and extravagance. It means the closing of refineries whose crack-brained managers try costly experiments in crystallization. It forbids kite flying at ruinous rates of discount. It stops wild speculations. If, when once welded into one well managed business, it chooses to raise the present rate of taxation, the people will

CHURCH GOSPEL AND CHRIST'S GOSPEL.

Hugh O. Pentecost in the Christian Union.

To formulate criticisms upon the church is an ungracious business; and, too, it is difficult because "church" is not easy to define, and there are many things which one may be perfectly well satisfied are true but which are difficult to put into words without overstating the truth. Nevertheless, I think I may say, without exaggerating, what is clear to me at least, that the defect of the church which is most serious and apparent is that she does not teach nor practice the religion of Jesus Christ.

Christianity is, to my mind, in its teaching and practice, judged by its creeds or the opinions of the majority, and by its acts and policy as an organized institution, no more, essentially, the religion of Jesus Christ than Buddhism. There are more doctrines and practices in Christianity which slightly ally themselves to what Jesus said and did than in Buddhism. But in being essentially unlike the religion of Jesus, Christianity must take her place with other religions. Do organized Roman Catholicism, or Episcopalianism, or Methodism, or even the simpler politics of Protestantism, bear more than the slightest resemblance to the religion of Jesus? But for certain catch-words I am sure the gospels might be studied by one who knew nothing of them, until he was familiar with the life and sayings of Jesus, and afterward the creeds, books of discipline, canons and institutes of organized Christianity examined by him in the same manner, without his recognizing the supposed relationship between them. So marked is the difference between Christianity and the religion of Jesus that one must practically make choice whether he will be a follower of Jesus or a Christian. He cannot be both. A minister or priest who becomes a follower of Jesus, as I understand him, can neither get nor keep a pulpit of organized Christianity.

To particularize: As to doctrine: When a lawyer asked Jesus the pivotal question, "What must I do to have eternal life?" Jesus told him he must love God and his neighbor; and to another, who declared he was accused of doing to do this, he added, "Sell all thou hast and give to the poor." This, then, is the gospel of Jesus. But the gospel of the church is not only not this, but it is the open secret of it. It declares that in order to have eternal life something must be believed. If the church should admit that Jesus taught the truth on this point, orthodoxy, "old" and "new" alike, would be destroyed. I have heard more than one good man declare from the pulpit that the gospel was not preached until after the death of Christ, because there was no gospel to preach till then. The gospel of Jesus was preached by himself, but, true or false, the gospel of the church was not preached till later. They are so unlike that one cannot believe them both.

Jesus said, "Take no anxious thought for the morrow"—the gospel of trust. The church, from every pulpit, says accumulate money "for a rainy day"—the gospel of economy. Jesus said, "When you go, go into your inner chamber"—the gospel of modesty in our relations with God. The minister prays openly in the synagogue for fifteen minutes more or less, at public service—the gospel of spiritual parade. Jesus said, "When you give, let not your left hand know what your right hand does"—the gospel of sincere benevolence. The church says, "Get your large givers to head the subscription list, and publish their names with the amount they give"—the gospel of phariseism. Jesus said, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you"—the gospel of transparent righteously. The commercial laity of the church say, "If you do, you will fail in business"—the gospel of getting on in the world. Jesus said, "Resist not evil"—the gospel of non-resistance. The majority opinion of the church shows contempt for his teaching by upholding wanton murder in defense of person or property, a punitive vision system, and capital punishment. I know of but two pulpits and one Christian newspaper that did not laud the hanging of the Chicago communists—the gospel of violence and revenge. Jesus said, "If a man smite you on one cheek, turn to him the other also"—the gospel of courageous self-control. The church, by a majority opinion, smiles superciliously at the precept Jesus said, "Lend, hoping not to receive again"—the gospel of persons. Christians again, "Lend at the highest rate of interest, upon gilt-edged security"—the gospel of property. Jesus said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to get into the kingdom of heaven." The simple truth, when we consider that no man gets rich except by defrauding, legally or illegally, some one else. The church opens a wide door for the entrance of the rich, and makes it harder for the poor man to enter than for a camel to go through the eye of a needle. The practical precepts of Jesus, some of which I have cited, and which mark his moral greatness to the spiritual mind, are rarely chosen for texts, and when they are it is generally to explain them away. There is one Christian in a hundred who believes them workable or makes any attempt to practice them. But much is made of the command to "baptize all men" and the institution of the eucharist; and more is made of the opinion of the author of the gospel of John concerning the extra-natural character of Christ.

We have the curious anomaly of Christianity which insists upon worshiping him as a divine being whose doctrinal teaching it repudiates, and whose practical precepts it declares impracticable and makes no attempt to follow. I may not trespass on your space too freely, and must very briefly mention what seem to me three well-nigh, if not quite, incurable defects in the church.

She does not live to do good in the world, but to strengthen and perpetuate herself. She ought to be purely and solely a mission army. But expensive ministers and mortgaged buildings compel her to seek for money more than souls. She itches for respectability with the restless desire of a parvenu. Socially approved and well-to-do people who will increase her revenues and raise her prestige she struggles to catch, but her fishing for those to whom she can only give, and from whom she can nothing get, is languid. Witness the complaisance with which the minister names the notables in his congregation. Witness the speed with which the church abandons the poor down town many and follows the rich up town few. Instead of using herself for the betterment of this world, the church seems to me more than willing to use this world for her own aggrandizement. Her aim, that for which she works most enthusiastically, is the exact reverse of what it should be. A hundred persons love their church and will work for it where one loves it and will serve them.

The church is always on the side of "things as they are." She is ever against the oppressed and the poor. She gives money lavishly in charities, she builds mission chapels for the poor, but she does nothing for them that is not as pleasing to her complaisant pride as it is helpful to the poor. The gentleman before whom the beggar doffs his hat and to whom he says, "God bless you," is about as pleased with his giving as the beggar; and the pleasure is equally injurious in either case; the pauper's delight and the pharisee's delicious sense of the difference between them

The church's goodness to the poor is all of that sort; she is gentle and benevolent as long as the poor are docile and grateful; she is a patroness of the poor. But when it comes to righting the wrongs of the oppressed and defrauded, or even seriously attempting to discover if there are wrongs to right, the church always shows that she has no such love for the poor as Jesus had. She never was known to attack a vested wrong until popular opinion drove her to it. She dabbles in dialectical reform, slightly, more missions, better tenement houses, cooking schools, associated charities (all but the missions begin and end in essays and newspaper articles, for the most part); but let a prophet point out a radical defect in the social system, which must be changed before anything of worth can be accomplished, and the church is as deaf as an adder. She would not see the evil of slavery until everybody else had. She will not even try to see the evil which mink and keep the people poor. "As much charity as you like for the worthy poor," says the church, "but talk not of social injustice, else we shall have to look upon you as one who threatens vested rights. Let the poor be contented, sober and industrious in this best of countries, and cultivate habits of church-going and Sabbath-keeping, and all will be well. If they suffer, it is their own fault." I believe that history and passing events alike attest the truthfulness of what I say.

The last criticism which I shall make is that the church does not allow, much less encourage, freedom of thought. She permits you to think as you like, but not within her communion—that is, if you happen to be a minister. You may think what you like, Roger Williams, but not in Massachusetts! This is not freedom of thought. In taking this position the church becomes the enemy of truth, the enemy of the mind. There is not a distinctive denomination in Christendom that does not put an imperative check on the mind at some point. And yet Jesus said: "And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?"

I hope my "criticism" will not seem bitter. There was a time when I felt bitterly upon these subjects, but it has passed. I know how many good men and women are in the church, doing God's work happily and conscientiously. They are contented in the church. I am half out of it. We may each do our appointed work.

Many good friends have said to me: "But even though these things are true, why abandon the church?" Why not remain within and do what you can to reform her? Why not live out your discipleship of Jesus within the church?" My reply is that I tried to, but I became such a disturber of the peace by preaching the gospel of Jesus in the church that I thought I ought to go, before some number of persons disagreed with themselves. If any one thinks he can follow out his honest thought within the church, if that thought leads him to discard the received opinions of the church and to attack vested wrongs which are as yet popular, or to accept the precepts of Jesus as workable, if he is a minister he will probably discover how mistaken he is. The church always has a place for priests; never any place for prophets.

A Matter Canadians Should Attend To.

TORONTO, Canada.—Will you kindly permit me to call the attention of your Canadian readers to the necessity of sending their names to our secretary, S. T. Wood, 55 Shuter street, Toronto. We are now circulating petitions asking the legislature to grant to each municipality the power to adopt its own method of taxation. Of course we are anxious that these petitions should have very wide circulation, and we therefore require the individual assistance of every man in Ontario to get signatures at once and have them forwarded without delay to the legislature, now sitting in this city.

We expect soon to have a bill prepared and brought forward in the house, and if we get this power of local option we shall expect to make short work of the personally and the income tax. Having gained these outworks we shall then proceed to storm the taxes on improvements. By that time we trust that we shall see a break in the superstitious reverence that bows to the yoke of indirect taxation and holds up its hands for a tax that leaves the toiler open to the full blast of foreign competition while it shields the capitalist from such competition—the tax that "makes no difference between the last dollar of the widow and the one among millions of the millionaire."

Such, in brief, is our plan of campaign, and we trust that every Canadian who sympathizes in our movement will feel it an honor to step into the vanguard of one of the grandest movements the world has ever seen. One man now is better than a thousand when we become the majority. W. A. DOUGLASS.

Anti-Poverty in Cincinnati.

The seventh regular meeting of the anti-poverty society of Cincinnati was held at Ell's hall, No. 200 Vine street, on Sunday February 5, and was more largely attended than any of its predecessors. Mr. Paul Garbury presided. After the opening hymn, "There's a wideness in God's mercy," by the Jubilee choir, the chairman delivered an address giving for the benefit of any new visitors the objects and aims of the society. A solo, "Rock of Ages" by Miss May Smith, was then sung, with Mrs. H. W. Harrison at the piano. Then came a very entertaining ethical address by Mr. C. H. Fitch, entitled "A Matter of Book-keeping," followed by Mr. L. W. Shott with a recitation, "The Printers' Angel." A solo by Miss Dee, "The New Kingdom," then an economic address by Mr. C. S. Walker, entitled "The Why, the How and the What," and the closing song, "New Crusaders' Marsellaise," completed the exercises.

At the next meeting the members will be expected to give their experiences, each speaker to be limited to three minutes in which to relate how he or she has "seen the cat," so aptly illustrated by Judge Maguire of California.

Justice in Taxation for Gas and Water Works.

FINDLAY, O., Feb. 2.—According to the groundhog theory, we are to expect six weeks' winter yet, so that except perhaps in Findlay and a few favored localities fuel is an important item to the American citizen. I see by THE STANDARD of the 14th ult. that Mrs. McCrory of Washington, D. C., suggested to her husband that all the citizens of Chicago should be allowed to participate in the benefits of natural gas underlying that city by a reduction of the expense of lighting and heating their houses and business places, instead of the Cook brewing company only. But Mrs. M. and her husband neglect to suggest a practical method of reaching the best possible results, even to a public mind familiar with the fact that natural gas is plentiful, and may and should be free to every citizen of this city as air or water.

In recent special correspondence to the Cincinnati Commercial Gazette, W. P. A. said that the city had purchased all the gas wells within a mile of the court house

were charging the general consumer five cents per store or grate per month for fuel, and were taking active measures toward abolishing even this small price; that the citizens in September last voted to bond the city \$100,000 for building a water works system, etc.

The active measures referred to amount to some of the citizens inquiring why the consumers should pay forty or fifty thousand dollars per annum for gas that costs simply the sinking of wells and service pipes laid, or cost of plant, represented by \$140,000 at six per cent, for payment of which the city is bonded and a levy authorized of three-tenths per unit upon all the taxable property. Why not elect a city council which will place the price of gas under such rules and regulations as will make it practically free to manufacturer and labor alike. And believing that fifteen or twenty thousand per annum is sufficient to pay the current expenses, interest and sinking fund, and that justice in taxation upon the whole should be placed upon the tax duplicate and collected as other taxes, leaving no need for another gas corporation under the title of gas trustees and superintendent, with an army of employees and all of them attendant political and personal preferences and prejudices, to be paid for by the people. They propose to push this question to the front in the coming municipal election.

If this be wise public policy and justice in taxation, why not abolish water rents, place the cost of supplying water upon the general tax duplicate, and make it free to consumers?

The public mind of Findlay is not yet prepared to place all taxes on land values, but desire those who have sold their lands at large valuations and are loaning the money at ten to fifteen per cent to others who are impeding and building up the city and encouraging industry, to pay taxes on their money values toward the expense of public improvements.

R.

Getting to the Root.

Toldeo News.

LEIPZIG, O.—As an example of the evils of speculation and the spirit of greed and love of gain, we find the following: In 1880, the Buckeye stave company of this city, which was then the largest in the country, had 1,000,000 staves in stock, worth \$100,000, and was then the largest in the country. They had 1,000,000 staves in stock, worth \$100,000, and were then the largest in the country. They had 1,000,000 staves in stock, worth \$100,000, and were then the largest in the country.

A. A. ST. L. B. D. T. C. D. E. F. G. H. I. J. K. L. M. N. O. P. Q. R. S.